

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY**

---

CALL No. 572.9588/Damm  
19964

D.G.A. 79.





(Asiatic Society Monographs.)

VOL. IV.

~~A 248~~  
THE BALOCH RACE.


A Historical and Ethnological Sketch.

19964



BY

M. LONGWORTH DAMES.



LONDON :

PUBLISHED BY THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY,

22, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1904.

CENTRAL

LIBRARY

Acc. No.

19964

Date

26-7-63

Ref. No.

~~89105/A.S.M.~~

572.9588/Dam.

# THE BALOCH RACE

## *A HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL SKETCH*

THE name Baloch is used in two distinct ways by travellers and historians. In the first place, it is employed as including all the races inhabiting the geographical area shown on our maps under the name of Balochistan; and in the second place, as denoting one especial race, known to themselves and their neighbours as the Baloch. It is in the latter signification that I employ the word. I take it as applying to the Baloch race proper, not as comprising Brahois, Nūmrīs and other tribes of Indian origin, nor any other races which may be found within the limits of the Khān of Kilāt's territory, or the Province of British Balochistan. On the other hand, it does comprise the true Baloch tribes outside those limits, whether found in Persia on the west, or in Sindh and the Panjāb on the east. In the native use of the word, apart from modern political boundaries, Balochistan includes Persian Balochistan, the Khānāt of Kilat, and the British Districts of Dera Ghāzī Khān (with the adjoining mountains), Jacobabad, and part of Shikārpur as far as the Indus. Applying the test of language, the true Baloches may be considered as those whose native language is (or was till recently) Balochi, and not Brahoi, Persian, Sindhi, Jaṭkī, or Pashto.

The spelling and pronunciation of the name have varied considerably, but the Baloches themselves only use one pronunciation—Baloch, with the short *a* in the first syllable

and the *o* in the second. The tendency of Modern Persian to substitute *ū* for an older *o* everywhere has had its effect in Western Balochistan, where the pronunciation Balūch is, I believe, heard. The sound *o* is historically older, and is recognised in old Persian dictionaries.<sup>1</sup> Other tribal names, such as Koch, Hot, Dōdāi, are also frequently given wrongly as Kūch, Hūt, Dūdāi.

The pronunciation of the vowel in the first syllable as a short *i* is unknown among the people themselves, but common in India. The form Bilūch or Biluch (Belooch) may be conveniently retained for such fragments of the race as are detached from the main stock and found isolated in India, such as the criminal tribe of the North-West Provinces and the Eastern Panjāb, the camel-men of Lahore, or the Pashto-speaking Bilūch of Paniāla in Dera Isma'īl Khan.

The adjectival form Balochī is properly applicable to the language only, and not the people, who know themselves only as Baloch, which occasionally takes a plural form, Balochān, but generally is used either for the individual, or collectively for the race. The form 'the Baluchis' or 'the Beloochees' frequently found is a mistake.

The Baloch race, in the present day, is divided into two main groups, which may be called :

1. The Sulaimānī Baloches;
2. The Mekrānī Baloches.

These groups are separated from each other by a compact block of Brahoi tribes, which occupy the country around Kilāt. These Brahois are generally classed under two heads—as Jahlāwāns, or Lowlanders, and Sarāwāns, or Highlanders.<sup>2</sup> Although some Baloch tribes are occasion-

<sup>1</sup> See Vuller's 'Lexicon Persico-Latinum,' s.v. He quotes the Farhang-i-Shu'ūrī for the sound *o*.

<sup>2</sup> From the Balochī words *jahlū*, below, and *sarū*, above, and *wān*, a man, which corresponds with the Persian *bān* or *wān*, as found in *Fārsūwān*, *bāghbān*, *nigāhbān*, *pāsbān*, *darwān*, *filwān*, etc. The derivation of *Fārsūwān* from *Fārsī-zabān* is incorrect.

ally included, it may be said that, on the whole, the Jahlāwāns and Sarāwāns are Brahois, and make use of the Brahoi or Kirdgālī language, while both groups of Baloches, the Sulaimānī to the north-east, and the Mekrānī to the south-west and west, speak the Balochi language in distinct but mutually intelligible dialects.<sup>1</sup>

The Baloches found throughout Sind and the Panjāb are an extension, by conquest and colonization, of the Sulaimānī Baloches, and are more or less assimilated by their Indian neighbours, while those of Sīstān must be classed rather with the Mekrānī tribes.

The tribal organization in Mekrān and Sīstān, with which I have no personal acquaintance, seems from all accounts to be much the same as that still prevailing among the tribes of the Sulaimān Mountains. Many of the same tribal names, such as Rind, Hot, Lashārī, Maghassī, Buledhī, are found in both tracts, but the notes which here follow apply primarily to the north-eastern or Sulaimānī tribes only.

The complete tribal organization is still retained by those tribes which inhabit the Sulaimān Mountains south of the thirty-first parallel of latitude to the plain of Kachī, and westwards to the Bolān Pass, the plain of Kachī itself (called on our maps Gandāva or Kach-Gandāva), and the territory stretching from the mountains and from Kachī towards the Indus, in some cases as far as the Indus itself, in others stopping short of it. The tribe is known by the name of *tuman*, and is presided over by a chief known as Tumandār. The post is hereditary, and is always held by a member of one family belonging to one clan of the tribe.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the introduction to my 'Sketch of the Northern Balochī Language' (extra number *J. A. S. B.*, 1880) I described the two dialects as mutually 'almost unintelligible.' I am now of opinion that this was too strongly expressed, as I have myself, speaking the northern dialect, been able to understand, and make myself understood by, persons speaking the Mekrānī dialect.

<sup>2</sup> The clan to which the chief belongs is known as the *phūgh-logh*, or house of the turban, the tying on of the turban being the outward sign



Each tuman is made up of several distinct clans, known as *phārā* (a Sindhi word meaning section or share), and these are again subdivided into septs known as *phallī*.<sup>1</sup>

The name *tuman* is from the Turkish *tūmān*, ten thousand, which appears to have been first used as an appellation of the nomad tribes of Persia in the time of the Seljūk Sultāns. Among the Baloches it is not so old, and never occurs in the heroic ballads which relate to the events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The oldest name for a tribe found in the poems is *bolak*,<sup>2</sup> also, like *tuman*,<sup>3</sup> a word of Turkish origin (*T. bulūk*, a band or crowd). This word seems rather to refer to the original clans, and not to the modern composite tribe or *tuman*, which is built up of several clans, connected one with another mainly by acknowledging a common chief. Within the clan the members are supposed to be of the same kindred, and as a rule the nucleus of the *tuman* consists of a few clans which consider themselves to be closely connected by blood. These have served as a centre of attraction for other less powerful or unattached

---

of assuming the chieftainship. The *phūgh-logh* answers to the *Khān-khel* in Pathan tribes. Such sections are the Balachānī among the Mazāris and the Raheja among the Bughtīs.

<sup>1</sup> Among the Marrīs the clans are known as *ṭakar* (from Sindhi *ṭakaru*, mountain?), the septs as *phallī*, and the smaller subdivisions as *phārā* ('Balochistan Census Report,' p. 122).

<sup>2</sup> This word frequently enters into Turkī place-names in Adhar-baijān, etc., such as Kum-buluk, Kizil-buluk, etc. It is found among the Afghāns (Utmān-bolak, near Peshawar), and a clan of Rind Baloches near Sibi is still called the Ghulām Bolak. It must not be confounded with the Turkī *bulūq*, a spring, which also occurs in place-names.

<sup>3</sup> These words *tuman* and *bolak* illustrate the Baloch tendency to shorten final syllables, and throw back the accent to the penultimate —e.g.:

<i>Tūman</i>	from	<i>Tūmān</i> .
<i>Bolak</i>	„	<i>Bulūk</i> .
<i>Pāttan</i>	„	<i>Pathān</i> .
<i>Bākkhal</i>	„	<i>Baqqāl</i> .
<i>Jāghdal</i>	„	<i>Jaṭ-gāl</i> .

clans, which have lost their original tribes either through internal quarrels or through the tribe having been defeated and broken up. The new tie is not always a very strong one, and such members of a tribe are the first to leave it if it is defeated, and look for a more powerful protector. Sometimes mere discontent with the chief, or an internal feud, is sufficient to drive a clan from one tuman to another.<sup>1</sup>

The oldest poems say that there were forty-four *bolaks*, of which forty were Baloches, and four were servile tribes dependent on them. There is no complete list of these *bolaks*. The oldest poem mentions seventeen Baloch and three servile clans, and a few others mentioned in other old ballads bring the number up to twenty-six, in addition to which three tribes with whom the Baloches were at war—the Langāhs, Nāhars, and Kungs—are mentioned.<sup>2</sup> Some of these tribes are not now known, and most of them are found as clans only, and not as organized tumans. The only names among them now found as tumans are Rind, Lashārī, Drīshak, Mazārī, Dombkī, and Khosa, to which list should be added the Hot tribe still found in Mekran, although broken up in the north. Many considerable tumans, such as the Lund, Leghārī, Bozdār, Bughtī, Kasrānī, Buledhī (or Burdī), and Jakrānī, do not appear at all in the older poetry.

The septs, or phallis, are the units out of which the larger organizations are built up, and may be compared to the gotras of a Hindū caste. In a few cases one of the larger clans composing a tuman appears to be rather a subordinate tribe than a clan, and has its own important sections, not all necessarily of the same blood. Sometimes there are more than one in this position. These may conveniently be known by the name of 'subtumans.' Such are the Haddiani section of the Legharīs tribe, the Durkānīs

<sup>1</sup> As regards the political or military organization of the tribe compare Mr. Hughes-Buller's remarks on pp. iv and 8, and also in chap. viii. of the 'Balochistan Census Report, 1892.'

<sup>2</sup> For details of these clans, see Appendix I.

and Lashārīs among the Gurchānīs, the Ghulāmānīs among the Bozdars, the Shambānīs among the Bughtīs, and the Mazārānīs among the Marrīs. These subtumans are very independent, and not so obedient to their Tumandārs as the ordinary clans. In many tumans one section, either clan or phallī, is found which has a hereditary feud with the chief, and is in habitual opposition to him. The Jindānīs among the Khosas, the Haibatānīs among the Leghārīs, and the Mistakānīs among the Mazārīs are examples of this. In spite of this, however, the general feeling in a Baloch tribe is in favour of supporting the chief's authority, and if he is a moderately good man according to the Baloch standard, just, generous, and of an even temper, he can generally enforce it without much difficulty. What a really able and straightforward man can do is shown by the history of Nawāb Sir Imām Bakhsh Khān, K.C.I.E., the Tumandār of the Mazārīs, a tribe formerly considered irreclaimable robbers and pirates on the Indus who have now settled into a law-abiding and loyal tribe, and over whom he still successfully presides, though blind and eighty years of age.<sup>1</sup>

The Baloches are nomads by instinct, and still prefer the wandering and pastoral life wherever it is possible, but the population tends more and more to become fixed as cultivation extends. But town life does not suit them, and although the Tumandār has in every case a fixed residence, it never becomes the nucleus of a Baloch town. Where the chief has selected an already existing town with a non-Baloch population of Hindū traders and Indian Moham-medan artizans, this population continues much as it was before. Few Baloches live in the towns; they prefer the open country. Their villages are collections of mud or stone huts, and in the mountains, where the population is still nomadic, a village or *halk* consists of a number of little enclosures 3 or 4 feet high, built of loose stones. On

<sup>1</sup> I regret to have to state that Sir Imām Bakhsh Khān has died since the above remarks were written.

these a temporary roof is spread, generally composed of matting (thaghard) made of the leaves of the phīsh (*Chamærops Ritchiana*); and when the community moves to another grazing ground, the roof is carried off, and the walls left standing for another occupation. Often recesses or ledges in cliffs are utilized, and no walls are necessary. Their wealth consists in camels, cattle, sheep, and goats, and their life is absolutely primitive and uncivilized. Yet the arts of carpet-making and embroidery flourish among them, and lead one to compare them to the Turkoman tribes, with whom they must at some time in their history have been in contact. Robbers they were and to some extent still are; to be a successful leader in raids and cattle-theft was a title to esteem, and *Rāhzan* or highwayman was a title of honour.

Such are the Baloches, and they have been described so often and with so much detail by so many travellers and frontier officers from Pottinger, Ferrier, and Masson to Sir T. Holdich and Major Molesworth Sykes, that it is unnecessary for me to go into further details. What I wish to consider now is the question of the origin and history of this remarkable race, what their position is among the races of mankind, and how they came to occupy the countries where they now dwell. These are by no means simple questions, as will appear from the variety of opinions which have been held upon them by persons well qualified to judge. Briefly, the origins favoured by one or the other are as follows:

1. The Turkoman origin, as advocated by Pottinger and Khanikoff;

2. The Arab origin (probably the theory most frequently held by travellers), strongly advocated of late by Sir T. Holdich;

3. The Rājput origin, as put forward by the late Dr. Bellew; and

4. The Iranian origin, favoured by Sir R. Burton, Lassen, Spiegel, and others.

Opinions as to the appearance of the Baloches have varied as much as those regarding their origin. Pottinger compared them to the Turkomans,<sup>1</sup> while Khanikoff detected a strong resemblance to the Kirghiz, probably to one of the least Mongolian in appearance of the tribes included under this name. Pottinger denied all resemblance to the Arabs, while, on the other hand, many travellers speak of their Arab features. Sir T. Holdich, who advocated their Arab origin in a paper on the 'Arabs of the North-West Frontier,' read before the Anthropological Society in 1899, considers the resemblance both in character and appearance very strong. Sir R. Burton, who knew the Baloches well and had an almost unrivalled acquaintance with the Arabs, did not favour this view. He says:<sup>2</sup> 'His appearance bears little resemblance to that of Ismail's descendants. The eye is the full, black, expressive Persian, not the small, restless, fiery Arab organ; the other features are peculiarly high, regular, and Iranian; and the beard, unerring indicator of high physical development, is long and lustrous, thick and flowing.'

The general vague idea that the Baloches have Arab features seems to be based mainly on the fact that they have long aquiline noses, which are supposed to look Jewish; and they are, therefore, assumed to be Semitic and Arabs. But this is not the Arab type. The latter is well described by Von Luschan,<sup>3</sup> who remarks that the Beduins must be considered as pure descendants of the Old Semitic race: 'They have long, narrow heads, dark complexion, and a short, small, and straight nose, which is in every respect the direct opposite of what we are accustomed to call a typical Jewish nose.' To this it may be added that the Arab nose is very commonly depressed at the root, a characteristic hardly ever found among the Baloches. The great abundance of hair and beard among

<sup>1</sup> Pottinger's 'Travels in Beloochistan,' 1816, pp. 268, 269.

<sup>2</sup> Burton's 'Sind Revisited,' 1877, vol. ii., p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in 'Man Past and Present,' by A. A. Keane, 1900, p. 502.

the Baloches is not an Arab feature. The hairiness is often extreme, and I have on several occasions seen Baloches whose backs were covered with hair.

Resemblances in general character and in customs, both to the Arabs and the Turkomāns, have been pointed out. On the whole, the resemblance to the Turkomāns seems the strongest, but that to the true Persian nomads is strongest of all. In any case, it must be remembered that a nomadic life in a parched-up country is likely to develop similar customs, even in distinct races. The fondness for horses characterizes the races of Central Asia and the Persian Plateau as strongly as the Arabs. The Baloches, when we first hear of them, were mounted archers, like the Parthians; they wore long red boots; they had striped rugs and carpets—all characteristics referring rather to Northern Persia than Arabia. When they came to close quarters they alighted and fought on foot, like the warriors of the *Shāhnāma*, a custom they still maintain. In one point of character they differ strikingly from the Arabs. They are an open-hearted race, easily pleased, and fond of jokes and laughter, while in religious matters they are free from fanaticism, sensible and tolerant, and willing to discuss opinions with an open mind. Their numerous ballads, legends, and traditions are singularly free from the supernatural element. It would be hard to find a greater contrast than that which they offer to the intense, concentrated, fanatical Arabs.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Since these remarks were written my attention has been drawn to Colonel E. Mockler's paper on the 'Origin of the Baloches' in *J. A. S. B.*, 1895. His contention is that the mass of the Baloch are the ancient inhabitants of Mokrān, and are identical with the Gedrosii of the Greeks, and that the Rinds are not in origin Baloch at all, but Arabs of the 'Alāfi tribe. He considers it probable that they are descended from the sons of Al Hārith al 'Alāfi, who fought against Al Hajjāj, and were finally driven into Sindh about A.H. 86. Their descendants were well known in Sindh for two hundred years later. Colonel Mockler also is of opinion that the supposed origin from Aleppo (Halab) is connected with the name 'Alāfi. While it is quite possible that some families

Dr. Bellew's attempt to identify the Baloches with the Rājput̃s was based on philological grounds only,<sup>1</sup> and, as far as I am aware, no comparison has been made as to their appearance. Indeed, it would not be easy to make out any strong resemblance. The difference between the Baloch and the Mohammedan Rājput̃ or Jatt̃ of the Indus valley is very clearly marked, both physically and mentally, and I need not enlarge upon it.

There remains the theory that the Baloches are Iranians, and this I believe to be the true one. Burton's views have already been alluded to, and Lassen, Spiegel, and Trumpp have come to the same conclusion. I shall here endeavour to show that it is borne out by anthropological and historical inquiries, and by evidence derived from the legends and language of the people themselves.

The Eastern Iranians are considered by modern anthropologists to be what is generally, for want of a better name, called the Aryan race, and to be strongly affected by that branch of the Caucasian race which has been named *Homo Alpinus*, which extends through Central Europe and Asia Minor to the highlands of the Hindū Kush.<sup>2</sup> One of the most distinguishing features of this race is its consistent brachycephaly, and its purest examples are found among the Tājiks of Turkestan and the Ghalchas of the Hindū Kush. The Baloches seem to be an offshoot of this race. They certainly, as I shall show further on, came into their present locations in Mekrān and on the Indian border from parts of the Iranian plateau further to the west and north, where they would naturally have been associated with

---

among the Rinds or other tribes are descended from these or other Arab settlers, I do not think that there is sufficient evidence to justify the adoption of this theory, or to separate the Rinds in origin from the mass of the Baloch race. As regards the connection between Baloch and Gedrosia, see p. 22.

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Ujfalvy, 'Les Aryens au Nord et au Sud de l'Hindou Kouch.' The subject is exhaustively discussed in this work.

other Iranian nomads, such as the Bakhtiārīs of the present day. They have brought with them a language of the Old Persian stock, with many features derived from the Old Bactrian rather than the Western Persian, and have intruded into a region which was always in ancient times regarded as part of India, and not of Persia, and which, both before and after the Mohammedan conquest, was peopled by Indian tribes—Rājapūts, Jatts, and Meds. But the Baloches still retain their brachycephaly, although Afghans to the north, Indians to the east, and Arabs to the south and on the Persian Gulf are all dolichocephalic.

The Arabs have a mean cephalic index of from 74 to 76, and the Afghāns about the same. The natives of India have a still lower index. Twenty-three castes of the North-West Provinces, as given by Mr. Risley, average 72·8, and seven of the Punjāb 73·1.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Risley gives the index for the Baloches as 80, but this is misleading, as his figures include several Baloches from Lahore and the neighbourhood, where they have long been assimilated by their Indian surroundings, and have lost all their national characteristics. Taking only the Baloches of the Trans-Indus districts as fairly representative of the race, I find the mean index to be 81·5. This is most remarkable, as no cephalic index approaching 80 is to be found throughout Northern India for two thousand miles, till we reach the Thibetans of the Darjiling Hills or the aboriginal tribes beyond Chittagong.


The Tājiks of different parts of the Iranian plateau have an index varying from 81 to 84, the Darwāzīs 81·4, and the Ghalchas 85. The figures given by M. de Ujfalvy for Bakhtiārīs, Kurds, and Gīlānīs are 88, 86, and 84, although these are based on too small a number of cases to be altogether trustworthy. The index of the Bombay Parsis, who have kept distinct amid their Indian neighbours, is 82·3. The curve for 60 Tājiks given by M. de

<sup>1</sup> Risley, 'The Tribes and Castes of Bengal,' vols. i. and ii.: Anthropometric Data.




Ujjalvy is given here for convenience of comparison with that of 45 Baloches from the districts of Dera Ghazi Khan and Dera Ismail Khan. The correspondence is certainly striking, the highest index in each case being the remarkable figure 95 or 96.<sup>1</sup>

The nasal index for the same 45 Baloches is 68.8. It is clear, therefore, that as far as the shape of the head



GRAPHIC CURVE OF CEPHALIC INDICES OF 60 TĀJIKS.



GRAPHIC CURVE OF CEPHALIC INDICES OF 45 BALOCHES.

is concerned the Baloches must be classed with the brachycephalic Iranians, and not with the dolichocephalic Arabs or Indians. This applies to the Baloches west of the Indus, while those who have settled east of that river show a tendency to approximate to the Indian type.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nūr Hassan of Dera Ghazi Khan. Cephalic length, 155; breadth, 148; index, 95.4.

<sup>2</sup> Since the above remarks were written I find that Professor Keane, in 'Man Past and Present' (Plate XI., p. 554), gives a Baloch as an illustration of the Lowland Tājik type.

In their organization and customs they certainly show signs of Turkoman influence, probably without much mixture of blood. The adoption of Turkī names for tribes (*tuman*, *bolak*, *el*, and *ulus*), for beasts of burden (*laḡh* and *olak*, *T. ulāgh*), and certain proper names (Chākar, Sanjar, Ghazan, Zangī), points towards such a contact, probably in the time of the Seljūk monarchy.

In his remarks on Sir T. Holdich's paper, 'The Arabs of our Indian Frontier,'<sup>1</sup> Mr. Kennedy gave it as his opinion that the Baloches might be descended from the Sakas, who settled in Drangiana, and gave it its later name of Sakastēnē (Sijistān, Sistān). That the Baloches may be descended from the Sakas, or from some other race of Central Asian invaders, is no doubt possible, but I do not think that we have at present sufficient evidence on which to base any definite conclusions. M. de Ujfalvy finds the descendants of the Sakas in the Bāltīs of Bāltistān, and supposes them to be a remnant of that race left behind during the invasion of India by the Karakoram passes. The Baltis are, like the Baloches, a race of horsemen, with abundant curly hair; but, on the other hand, they are extremely dolichocephalic, having a mean index as low as 72. In spite of this, however, it might be quite possible for the Baloches to be derived from the branch of the race settled in Sistān if we could prove that that province was the cradle of the Baloch race. But although I formerly believed that this was the case, I have been obliged by historical evidence to come to the conclusion that their connection with Sistān is of comparatively modern date, and that their origin must be looked for further north, in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea—in ancient Parthia, in fact. Some connection with the Parthians seems possible, even probable; but more than this cannot be asserted. In any case, even if the Baloches have originally sprung from some Scythian or non-Iranian race, they have long since been absolutely assimilated by the Iranians.

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1899, vol. xxix., p. 18.

Sporadic cases of the settlement of Arab families among the Baloches probably occurred during their residence in Karmān and Mekrān, as such cases occurred throughout Persia, Turkistan, Afghanistan, and Northern India; but in such cases the ultimate effect on the general population is but small. Isolated instances of the survival of Arab features may perhaps be pointed out, and it seems to be the general opinion of travellers in Mekrān that the families of the chiefs show such features rather than the greater number of their tribesmen. But among the tribes along the Indian Frontier—‘the Arabs of the Indian Border,’ as Sir T. Holdich calls them—with whom I can claim a long and intimate acquaintance, I am convinced that there is no such distinction. The typical and characteristic Baloch face is found equally among chiefs and tribesmen, and true Arab features are very rare.

The Rājput origin advocated by the late Dr. Bellew<sup>1</sup> deserves some consideration, but his attempt to prove that all Baloches, jointly with a very large section of Pathāns, were of Indian descent was doomed to failure. If he had confined himself to stating that there are some Rājput and Jaṭṭ elements in the present Baloch nation, and that the Pathān tribes of the Sulamān range are, to a considerable extent, of Indian origin, he would have obtained general assent; but he attempted to show, on philological grounds mainly, that every tribe or clan whose name he could ascertain was descended from some Indian caste or *got*, and he displayed a good deal of ingenuity in comparing these names with those of their supposed Indian progenitors.

He commences with the name Baloch, which he considers identical with the Balāecha (Bālaichā) clan of the Chauhān Rājputs, and at the same time he finds a clan of the Afghān Durrānī named Bahrech, which he identifies with another Chauhān clan, the Bharāecha (properly,

<sup>1</sup> ‘Ethnography of Afghanistan,’ by H. W. Bellew, C.S.I., 1891, pp. 171, 172, and 175-187.

Bhuraichā). Leaving the Afghan identification, with which I cannot deal here, that of the words 'Baloch' and 'Bālaichā' rests on no evidence except the similarity of the sounds. Even on philological grounds it is improbable, for although original *o* and *ū* are frequently converted in Balochī into *e* and *i*, the reverse process never takes place. This objection applies also to the derivation from Mlechha (see p. 21). The Chauhāns were at no time one of the Rājput tribes occupying the Indus Valley, either in Sindh or the Panjāb. The great mass of Chauhāns is still found on the site of their ancient kingdom, in Karnāl and Ambāla, in the United Provinces and Eastern Rājputāna. The Varaich, who probably represent the Bālaichā clan, are at present a strong Musalmān Jāt community in the Gujrat and Siālkot districts of the Panjāb. There is no evidence whatever that they migrated westward at any time, and forsook their fertile plains for the arid ridges and plateaus of Mekran. But, although Baloch is now the name for the whole race, and has been so since it has been known to history, Dr. Bellew thought that the Baloch were originally only a branch, and that the whole race was known as Rind, a name which he derives from the Rann of Kach. His words are: 'The name "Rind" is a territorial designation applied to the Baloch or Balāecha and other Chohān Rājput tribes, whose original seats were in the Chohān country on the banks of the Lonī,' the actual meaning of the words 'Rind' and 'Baloch' being thus reversed. Rind is, in fact, the title of one branch of the Baloch, as I shall show below, and is a nickname, like many other tribal names, meaning 'scoundrel' or 'cheat' (like the Indian Ṭhag). Nor is there any evidence to show that the Chauhāns were ever settled on the river Lonī, nor in the neighbourhood of the Rann of Kach.

Dr. Bellew then proceeds to consider what he calls the three main divisions of the Baloch—viz., the Brahoī, the Nūmrī, and the Rind. I shall not follow him as regards

the first two, neither of which has any right to the name Baloch. They differ from the true Baloch in every respect, and I am only dealing with the latter, which Dr. Bellew here calls Rind. The true historical name is Baloch, and I shall be able to show how the Rinds obtained their prominence among the Northern Baloches, which has led to the confusion of names. When he comes to the Baloch properly speaking, he gives a list of forty-two names of tribes, which he proceeds to deduce from various Indian originals. I say Indian, as he does not confine himself to Chauhāns, or even to Rājputs, but includes Brāhmans, Jātts, and low-caste tribes. Out of the forty-two names, eleven are unknown to me—viz., Bāri, Utān, Kaodai (perhaps a Sindhī method of writing Korāi), Katwār, Korwā, Landī, Lattī, Malāū, Merī, Sajodī, and Raksh. The last-named perhaps stands for Rakshānī, a Brahoi tribe and small Baloch clan. None of these can be found either as tribal or clan names.

Of the remainder, six—viz., Gichkī, Khetrān, Lorī, Mamasānī, Med, and Mārwarī—cannot strictly be called Baloch.

The Gichkī are an assimilated tribe of Mekrān, now speaking the Balochi language, and commonly classed as Baloch; but they are known to be of comparatively recent Indian origin—some accounts say Sikh, and some Rājput. Their settlement in Mekrān was not earlier than the latter part of the seventeenth century. It is very likely that the tribe comprises some true Baloch elements. Dr. Bellew makes Gichkī equivalent to Kajkī, and derives it from the Kachwāha Rājputs, which is clearly impossible on philological grounds. The termination *kī*, commonly used in Sindhī to form adjectives (such as Balochkī, Jatkī, Brahuīkī, etc.), shows that the name must be of Sindhī origin.

The Khetrāns are also a tribe of undoubtedly Indian origin, occupying a tract in the Sulaimān Mountains, between the Baloch and Pathān tribes, and still speaking their original Indian language—a dialect peculiar to them-

selves and akin to Sindhī and Jaṭkī, with which I have some acquaintance. It is hardly necessary to observe that their name cannot be derived, as Dr. Bellew supposes, from Khater, 'mercantile Rājput,' but means 'cultivator,' and must be referred to Khetr (Skr. Kshetra), 'a field.'

The Med, or Medh, are the aboriginal, non-Baloch fisher tribe of the Mekrān and Sindh coast, known long before the appearance of the Baloches, who use the name as a term of contempt; and those near the Indus apply it to the fishermen of that river, and couple it with the name Māchhī. A bard, in hurling a taunt at his adversary of another tribe, tells him that Medhs and Māchhīs are not fit companions for Mīr Hamza!

The Lorī are the same as the Doms, the hereditary minstrels of Indian origin, known in Persia and Balochistān under this name Lorī, or Lūrī—that is, probably, natives of Lūr, or Lūristān. The picturesque legend told in the 'Shāhnāma' of their introduction from India into Persia by Bahrām Gor is well known. They are attached as bards to Baloch tribes, but are not, and do not pretend to be, of Baloch blood themselves. Their customs and appearance are those of the Doms or Mirāsīs of India.

The Mārwarīs are the well-known Indian banking caste originating in Mārwar. I do not know how the name found its way into a list of Baloch tribes.

The Mamasānī of Sīstān are, I believe, Brahoīs, and not Baloch. This is Dr. Bellew's own opinion (see 'From the Indus to the Tigris,' 1874, p. 257).

The remaining twenty-five names on his list are Baloch, but a large number of well-known names is omitted. A few specimens of the method of derivation, on which the argument as to their Indian origin is founded, will be sufficient.

In the list occur two names, Bolida and Burdī. These refer in reality to the same tribe, the Buledī or Buledhī, a name derived undoubtedly from the Boleda Valley in Mekrān. Burdī is the Sindhī form, due to the fondness of

that language for changing *l* to *r* and throwing the accent back to the antepenultimate; but the Burdīs of Sindh are never spoken of in Balochī by any other name than *Buledhī*. Dr. Bellew gives distinct origins for the two names. He says: 'Bolida (mentioned by Ptolemy) is the same as the Pulādī or Fāolādī of the Hazārah, and has given its name to a district in Mekrān. The original name seems to have been Bol, Bola, or Pola (whence the Bol temple of Multān, Bolan Pass, and Pūlajī<sup>1</sup> Shrine not far from it) for Bālā Brahman, and the form Bolidā<sup>2</sup> is the Sindhī correlative of the Hindī Bolikā, of the Bola, Pola, or Bālā.' Dr. Bellew explains Burdī as representing the Bhurta Solānkī Rājput. So that the Buledhī tribe in one form of its name is Bālā Brahman, and in the other Bhurta Rājput.

Another example is the name Nutkānī, as to which Dr. Bellew observes: 'Natka or Natkānī is for Nat Indian tribe of gypsies, conjurers, rope-dancers, etc.' This is a most baseless conjecture. The name is not Natka or Natkānī, but Nutkānī, as pronounced by outsiders, and Nodhakānī in Balochī. *Ānī* is the genitive plural termination used to form patronymics. Nodhak is a common proper name of Baloches, a diminutive of *Nodh*, 'a cloud,' a word which enters into other proper names, as *Nodho*, *Nodhbandagh*. Nodhakānī or Nutkānī simply means 'the descendants of Nodhak.'

Mazārī means the son of Mazār, the 'tiger,' a true Baloch form. Dr. Bellew identifies the tribe with the Mysarī, 'Indian Desert Tribe.' I have not been able to obtain any information as to the Mysarī, but the name, if correctly given, looks like a corruption of Maheswarī (like Mysore, from Maheśwar). Dr. Bellew also derives the Pathān tribe of the Sulaimāns, known as Zmarī, from a Hindū tribe Maisarī, perhaps the same. He does not note

<sup>1</sup> The correct form of this name is Phulejī फुलेजी .

<sup>2</sup> It may be noted that *dā* denotes the genitive in Panjābī, but is not a Sindhī termination.

that Mzarai or Zmarai in Pashto means the same as Mazār in Balochī, 'a tiger.'

It is not necessary to go further through this list. I can only find one case among all those given by Dr. Bellew in which a Baloch tribe is really connected with the Indian ancestry assigned to it—that is, the case of the Jakrānī from the Jakhar Jātts, a tribe of comparatively late adoption into the Baloch confraternity.<sup>1</sup>

There are, however, cases of adoption of Indian tribes not noticed by him. The most important of these is the case of the Dodāi and their descendants, the modern Gurchānī tribe, who are, undoubtedly, to a great extent sprung from the Somra Rājpūts of Sind, as I shall show further on.

It is, no doubt, also possible to urge that the tribes which bear territorial names derived from localities in Mekrān *may* have been derived from the original Jātts of that region, and not from the Baloch invaders, but there is no evidence that this was the case. There are several names of this type, for instance :

Buledhī, from Boleda.

Lashārī, from Lāshār.

Magassī, from Magas.

Kulāchī, from Kolānch.

Gishkhauri, from the Gish Khaur, the name of 'a torrent.'

Dashtī, from one of the numerous Dashts, or tablelands, found throughout the country.

Kahīrī from the name of a 'torrent,' so-called from the Kahīr (*Prosopis spicigera*), which grows along its course. There are several so called.

The Buledhī have been alluded to already. The Lashārī are one of the main divisions of the Baloch race, and the Magassī a tribe generally classed as a branch of the Lashārī. It may be noted that Magas is a place situated

<sup>1</sup> See Eastwick, 'Dry Notes from Young Egypt,' 1851, p. 110.



in a tract of country called Lāshār in Persian Balochistan.<sup>1</sup> Magassī is sometimes used as a term interchangeable with Lashārī; Ferrier ('Caravan Journeys,' p. 431) divides the Baloches of Sīstān into Nervuis (Nārūs), Rinds, and Mekses (*i.e.*, Magassis).

Kulāchī is probably from the Kolānch Valley in Mekrān. This tribe, once powerful, but now of small importance, has left its name on the map. The town of Kulāchī, in Dera Ismail Khan, though now belonging to the Gandāpūr Afghans, bears it, and the great seaport of Karāchī has the same name, with the usual Sindhī change of *l* to *r*.

The name of the Kahīrīs, who are in the present day a Levitical tribe with certain peculiar attributes, is probably derived from one of the Kahīrī torrents. The legend given in the Tārīkh-i-M'asūmī (1600 A.D.)<sup>2</sup> derives the name direct from the Kahīr-tree, asserting that one of the ancestors of the tribe rode on a tree of this sort, making it move like a horse when he struck it with a whip.

Perhaps the Kalmatī should be added to this list. Sir T. Holdich supposes them to derive their name from Kalmat, and this is, *primâ facie*, probable. They are stated to be a peculiar tribe with certain religious superstitions attached to them, and it seems possible that their name may be derived from the Karmatī or Karmatian heretics, who were driven into Mekrān by Mahmūd of Ghaznī and Muhammed bin Sām.<sup>3</sup> Neither Kahīrī nor Kalmatī are probably Baloches by origin, though long associated with them and mentioned in old ballads.

It is not necessary to go further into Dr. Bellew's lists of subdivisions or of what he calls Jat Baloches. Only two Baloch tribes, the Jatōi and Jakrāni, are included in the latter list. The rest are the names of miscellaneous Indian tribes with no claim to be called Baloch.

I may here allude to the derivation of the word 'Baloch'

<sup>1</sup> I owe this information to the kindness of Major P. Molesworth Sykes.

<sup>2</sup> E. D. i. 238.

<sup>3</sup> E. D., i., pp. 459, 492.

from the Sanskrit 'Mlechha,' which Mr. Crooke brought forward in the discussion on Sir T. Holdich's paper above alluded to. The derivation is not a new one. Von Bohlen suggested it long ago, and Lassen dismissed it<sup>1</sup> as resting on an unsupported guess. He added: 'It is sufficient to remark that Mlechha was never specially used in Indian writings of the non-Indian races to the west of the Indus, but applied to all barbarians without distinction. Also the difference between the two names is so great that no comparison should be made without the strongest reasons.'

To this it may be added that the word Baloch was in use long before the movement of the tribes to the Indian frontier, or even into Mekrān. It is found in the Arab chroniclers of the early part of the tenth century and in the 'Shāhnāma,' and its origin should be sought rather in Persia than in India.

No explanation of the name Baloch as yet given appears to be satisfactory. Natives of India in the present day say that it comes from 'bad-log,' or bad people, regarding which explanation no remarks are necessary! The Baloches themselves say it is a corruption of 'bar-lūch,' *bar* meaning the wilderness, and *lūch* naked, owing to their progenitor, the offspring of Mīr Hamza and a perī, having been found abandoned in the wilderness.

R. B. Hetu Rām, in his 'Balochī-nāma,' says: 'In the language of Halab, dwellers on the skirt of the hills and in the mountains are called Baloch.'<sup>2</sup>

Ferrier ('Caravan Journeys') says it is from *bé*, without, and *leuct*, naked.

Colonel E. Mockler<sup>3</sup> mentions another popular derivation of the name, according to which Baloch is compared to Bad-roch, or 'evil day.' This is another of the punning and abusive nicknames given to the race by others who had suffered from their depredations. Colonel Mockler,

<sup>1</sup> 'Z. f. d. K. d. M.,' 1842, Band iv., p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> Douie's 'Trans. of Balochī-nāma,' p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> J. A. S. B., 1895.

however, thinks that Badroch, or Badrosh, in Balochi may be taken as 'equivalent to Gadrosh, or Gadros, of the more ancient Pehlevī, or Zend, and to Gadros-ii, or Gedrosii, of the Greeks. Badroch, from the interchangeability of the liquids *r* and *l*, is equivalent to Badloch, out of which the *d* must naturally drop, leaving Baloch equivalent to "the Gedrosii."'

With regard to this derivation, it may be remarked that no such word as 'bad' or gad' is found in the ancient languages, and that while a modern *g* or *gr* often represents in Persian (and still more often in Balochi) an original *r*, the reverse process is unknown. An ancient *G*, such as is found in the name Gedrosia, dating from the fourth century B.C., can hardly be represented by a *B*, as in Baloch. If I have been successful in showing that the Baloch name was not known in Mekrān before the thirteenth century, it seems a useless task to attempt to associate them with the Gedrosii of sixteen hundred years before.

Baloch is a Persian word, which, in addition to its use as a proper name, means, as explained in the *Burhān-i-Qāṭi*' and other dictionaries, a cockscomb or crest. It seems possible that the proper name was originally a nickname derived from the use of such a crest or badge; many tribal names are uncomplimentary nicknames, like our Whig and Tory, and others applied to religious sects. A passage in the '*Shāhnāma*' affords some support to this theory. In the enumeration of the warriors of Kai Khusran's army, the poet comes to the Baloch led by Āshkash, and in one text he describes them as

سگالیده جنگ و بر آورده خوچ

'Intent on war, with exalted cockscomb crests.'<sup>1</sup> This

<sup>1</sup> This passage is an example of the extraordinary variety of readings in the text of the '*Shāhnāma*.'

In Mohl's text the passage reads (ii., p. 586),

سپا هي ز گردان کوچ و بلوچ—سگالیده جنگند مانده قوچ

may be considered as evidence that in the traditions or poems made use of by Firdausi the Baloches were represented as wearing such crests, and as the words 'Baloch' and 'Khoch' have the same meaning, it seems that *Baloch* must be a nickname.

The reputation of being raiders and robbers which the Baloch have always borne among their neighbours has earned them many uncomplimentary epithets, which are found among the tribal names.

The following are examples :

Rind (Per.), knave, debauchee, wanderer.

Lund (Per.), similar meaning. A legend explains it as meaning 'fool,' but I cannot find that the word ever bore this signification.

Khosa (Sindhī), a robber ; also a fever.

Mari (Sindhī), a plague or epidemic.

Laghār (Balochī), foul or dirty.

The name of the Koch, the race always coupled with the Baloch in the earliest accounts, also means 'nomad' in Persian (*cf.* Pashto Kochai, 'a wanderer').

Some of the clan names also are either nicknames or (possibly) have a totemic origin. I may mention the following :

Syāh-phādī (Blackfeet), a clan of the Durkāni Gur-chānīs.

---

which he translates: 'Il était accompagné des braves de Cutch et de Beloudjistan, qui sont avides de combats comme des bœufs.'

Vullers, in his Persian Dictionary (*s.v.* سگالیدن), gives it as quoted above in the text, and this also is the reading of the oldest MS. of the poem in the British Museum (21,103, addl., f. 70). In his edition of the 'Shāhnāma,' however, Vullers does not give this reading, but the following (ii. 780),

سگالیده جنگ ماندن خوچ

which is also given in the Bombay lithographed edition.

Macan's Calcutta edition omits the whole passage as to the numbering of the armies, which is of great interest throughout.

The words *خوچ* and *قوچ* both mean 'ram,' but as *قوچ* ends in a ج and not چ, it is improbable as a rhyme to *بلوچ*. The reading in the text seems preferable to both.

Gul-phādū (Flowerfeet), a clan of the Drīshaks.

Gandagwālagh (the small red ant), a clan of the Durkānī.

Syāh-lāf (Blackbellies), all the Mazārīs, with the exception of the Bālāchānī.

Kalphur (an aromatic plant, *Glinus lotoides*), a clan of the Bughtīs.

The tribal names Hot (*hero*) and Mazārī (*sons of tigers*) are examples of epithets of another kind.

Bozdār means *goatherds*.

The Balochī is, as is well known, an Iranian idiom, nearly related to modern Persian, but at the same time showing many points of resemblance to the Zend, or Old Bactrian, rather than to the Old Persian.<sup>1</sup> The vocabulary has borrowed a large number of words from the neighbouring settled races speaking Modern Persian on one side, or the Indian idioms Sindhī and Jaṭkī on the other. Brahoi has furnished a few words, and has itself borrowed extensively from Balochī. The Arabic element is not very extensive, and mainly consists of such religious and abstract terms as are common to all Muhammadan nations. Most of these have been introduced through the medium of Modern Persian. Had the Arab element been an important or ruling one, we should expect to find the words relating to government, tribal organization, war, weapons, horses, and other matters in which the ruling caste of a nomad race mainly concerns itself, largely derived from the Arabic, much as in English the corresponding class of words is derived from Norman-French. But hardly a single word of this class comes from Arabic, though Sindhī has been drawn on to some extent. Most words of this class belong to the original Iranian element; a few are Turkish.

Certain indications as to origin may also be deduced from

<sup>1</sup> 'Die Sprache der Balūtschen,' by W. Geiger, No. VI., in the 'Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie,' gives a full summary of the literature of the subject.

the proper names in use among Baloches. All Muham-madans have to a great extent abandoned their original nomenclature, and adopted the system of religious names drawn from the Qur-ān, the various divine names, the Prophet, the early Khalifas, and other persons famed in the history of the religion. Nevertheless, original names have survived in many languages, especially in Persian; and Persian, as well as Arabic names, are in use throughout India, Afghanistan, and Balochistan. There is among the Baloches also a very large and important element which cannot be derived from either of these sources.

I have made a list of 190 proper names, including all the names I have found in the older poetry and in the genealogies. Of these only fifty-three are Arabic names, twenty are Persian or compound Persian and Arabic (as Dost Muhammad, Imām Bakhsh, etc.), four are Turkish, and twenty-three seem to be of Indian origin, although mostly not identical with modern Hindū names. The remaining ninety are names peculiar to the Baloches, of which a good many are capable of explanation from Balochī or from the older Iranian languages, and I am of opinion that the Arabic element is less important than among most Muhammadan races.

The names of places afford little information. The Baloches, as recent immigrants into Mekrān and the Sulaimāns, have accepted most names as they found them. The majority seem to be of Indian origin. A few Balochi names are found, such as Suhrāf ('red water'), Syāhāf ('black water'), Geh ('good'), Nafuskh ('step-daughter'), Chighard ('acacia'), Dehghwar, Gandakindaf; and names commencing with the letters *gw*, such as Gwādar, Gwattar, Gwajak, Gwarokh, are probably of Baloch origin, as *gw* in that language stands for an original *r* or *w*, which in modern Persian becomes *b*. The total number of such names is small.

The Balochi language is rich in terms for the natural features of a mountainous country—mountains, streams,

valleys, spurs, cliffs, passes, etc. The only apparently Arabic word among these is *Khaur*, 'a torrent bed' (Ar. *Khor*), found also in Pashto, in the form *Khwar*. The common Arabic words *wādī* and *jebel*, which are to be found from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean, never occur away from the coast which is navigated by Arab sailors.

#### HISTORY AND LEGEND.

The first mention of the Baloches in history is found in the Arabic Chronicles of the tenth century, the fourth of the Hijrī era; but Firdausī, whose great poem, the 'Shāhnāma,' was finished in A.H. 400, refers to an earlier period than any of these. The latter part of this poem, relating to the Sassanians, must be regarded as mainly historical—at least, as much so as the narratives of the prose chronicles, such as those of Mas'ūdī and Tabarī and the Rauzatu's-safā, which embody quite as much legendary matter as the 'Shāhnāma.' The earlier part of the 'Shāhnāma' is, of course, mainly mythical. The Baloches are introduced as forming part of the armies of Kai Kāūs and Kai *Khusrau*; and this means no more than that their name occurred among others in the ballads or legends which Firdausī drew upon. Kai Kāūs is shown as employing 'the warriors of Pārs and of the Koch and Baloch, the troops of Gīlān and of the plain of Saroch.'<sup>1</sup> The passage describing the assembly of the warriors by Kai *Khusrau* for his expedition against Āfrāsyaḅ is also noteworthy:<sup>2</sup>

'After Gustaham came Ashkash. . . . His army was from the wanderers of the Koch and Baloch, intent on war and with exalted cockscomb crests, whose back none in the world ever saw. Nor was one of their fingers bare

همي پيلي پارس و کوچ و بلوچ<sup>1</sup>  
ز گیلان جنگي و دشت سروج

<sup>2</sup> See *supra*, p. 22.

of armour. . . . His banner bore the figure of a tiger. . . .’ This passage is interesting as showing the crest borne by the Baloches, alluded to above as possibly explaining the meaning of their name.<sup>1</sup>

The allusion under Naushīrvān is more important historically. This King is not a mythical personage, he is the Chosroes of the classical writers who fought against Justinian, and was only kept within bounds by the genius of Belisarius; and Firdausī described his exploits as accurately as was possible to him. He represents Naushīrvān as making war against the Alāns, who lived near the Caspian Sea; he then transports him suddenly to the river of Hindustan (no doubt the Indus), whence he returned after receiving the submission of the people. On his return he was met by the news that the country was being laid waste by the Baloches and Gīlānīs, and determined to subdue them. Turning first against the Baloches, he learnt from a Dehkān that his predecessor, Ardashīr (presumably Ardashīr Bābakān), had in vain tried to subdue them. Naushīrvān, however, surrounded their mountains with his troops, and ordered them to destroy every Baloch,<sup>2</sup> great or small. This was carried out, so that there was not a Baloch left on the mountains, and their oppressions and tyranny disappeared. (This is the reading of the oldest MS.;<sup>3</sup> but the text used by Mohl reads *ستم کردن کوچ*, ‘the oppression of the Koch,’ instead of *ستم کردن و رنج*, ‘oppression and grief.’) Later on, however, we find that the Baloches were by no means exterminated, but were serving in Naushīrvān’s army, and, together with the men of Gil, were drawn up armed with golden shields

<sup>1</sup> Major P. Molesworth Sykes has drawn my attention to the fact that the tiger-banner also furnishes a valuable indication as to the home of the Baloch, the tiger being found only on the shores of the Caspian.

<sup>2</sup> Some MSS. have ‘every Koch,’ and some add ‘the Kurds’ as well.

<sup>3</sup> British Museum, 21,103, addl. Dated about A.H. 675.



to receive the ambassador of the *Khāqān* of *Chīn*. On another occasion we find that the King's friends and freemen marched towards *Ādhar-bādagān* (*Ādharbaijān*) with a force made up of contingents from *Gilān*, *Dailamān*, the mountains of the Baloch, the plain of *Saroch*, and the swordsmen of *Koch*. Then, in some texts, but not in the best MS., follows a passage to the effect that up till that time, since the world was the world, there had never been a single *Koch* who did not pillage and burn the towns.<sup>1</sup> The narrative, after relating the conquest of the Baloches by *Naushīrvān*, continues to give an account of his war against the men of *Gīl* and *Dailam*—that is to say, of *Gilān* and *Adharbaijān*. This association of the Baloch with the races near the Caspian Sea seems to make it probable that they were then located in a more northerly province than *Karmān*, where they are next heard of. *Firdausī* must have drawn this description from the traditions. Had he been describing the Baloch simply as they were in his own time, he would certainly have shown them as occupying *Karmān* and the *Lūt*, and plundering the routes leading towards *Sistān* and *Khurāsān*; there would not have been any especial association with the *Gilānis*.

The fact that the names of Baloch and Koch are frequently coupled by *Firdausī* is not necessarily a proof that this was anything more than a method of speaking prevalent in his day. In the oldest MS. of the poem the name 'Koch' occurs very seldom, and not at all in the passage describing the conquest of the Baloch by *Naushīrvān*. It is probable that in many passages later copyists introduced the name, as the phrase 'Koch and Baloch' had become customary in their time; and this association of names was due simply to the fact that the two races had settled near each other in *Karmān*, although

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that all the passages in which the name Koch appears are subject to great variation in the MSS., while the name Baloch appears throughout without variation.

(as the allusion in Yākūt shows) they were by no means on friendly terms.

The cause of the migration of the Baloches to Karmān may have been their conquest by Naushīrvān, or more probably the invasion of the Ephthalites or White Huns, which took place at that period, and who are also alluded to in the 'Shāhnāma' under the name of Hayitāl. The Arab conquest of Karmān took place in A.H. 23, or only sixty-five years after the death of Naushīrvān. The conquest was carried out by 'Abdu'llāh, under the orders of the Khālīf 'Umar; and all the accounts agree that the Arabs found the mountains of Karmān occupied by a race known as Koch (in Arabic Qufj or Qufṣ), and some add the Baloch. None of the authorities are contemporary or nearly so. The earliest writers who deal with the subject are: Al-Bilāzurī, who died in A.H. 279 (A.D. 892); Tabarī,<sup>1</sup> who wrote about A.H. 320 (A.D. 932); Mas'ūdī, whose work is dated A.H. 332 (A.D. 943); and Istakh̄rī, *circa* A.H. 340 (A.D. 951). The first two of these, in describing the conquest, only mention the Koch or Qufṣ; while Mas'ūdī and Istakh̄rī, whose works are geographical and deal with their own times, speak both of Koch and Baloch. Weil ('Geschichte der Chalifen,' i. 95), following Tabarī, only mentions the Kufedj or Kufess. Elliott and Dowson (i. 417) state that when 'Abdullāh conquered the capital of Karmān, the aid of the men of Kūj and Bulūj (*i.e.*, Koch and Baloch) was in vain solicited by the Karmānīs. The authority for this statement appears to be the Tārīkh-i-Guzīda, which was not written till A.H. 730 (A.D. 1329), and has not much weight. The best geographical authorities are Istakh̄rī and Mas'ūdī, the valuable work of Idrīsī (A.H. 543—A.D. 1151), and the gazetteer of Yākūt, who wrote in A.H. 615, but relies on earlier authorities.

It may be considered as established that the Baloches were settled in Karmān at the commencement of the fourth century of the Hijra; and it is possible, but not proved,

<sup>1</sup> Zotenberg's 'Tabarī,' iii. 516, etc.

that they were already settled there when the Arab conquest took place three hundred years before. The Baloch occupied a territory adjacent to that of the Koch, but were quite distinct from them. Mas'ūdī<sup>1</sup> only says that he is not able to give any account of the Qufṣ, the Baloch, and the Jatt (Zutt), who dwell in the regions of Karmān. He is the only writer who mentions Jatts in Karmān, all other accounts showing them as occupying Mēkrān at that period. Istakhrī gives fuller details.<sup>2</sup> He describes the Koch as living in the mountains, while the Baloch inhabited the desert. Both races spoke languages of their own distinct from Persian, which was the ordinary language of Karmān. The version translated by Ouseley puts the desert inhabited by the Baloch to the south of the mountains, and towards Mēkrān and the sea; and one passage in the Arabic version bears this out—viz.: 'Karmān is bordered on the east by Mukarān, and the desert between Mukarān and the sea towards the Bulūṣ (Baloch)'; but further on it says: 'The Bulūṣ live on the tableland of the Qufṣ Mountains, and no one else enters these mountains; they have cattle and tents like the Beduin, and the routes through their country are not unsafe.' 'The Qufṣ,' it says, 'are believed to be of Arab descent, and live under their own chiefs.' Further south, again, lives another race, apparently distinct from both Koch and Baloch. According to the Persian version they inhabit the mountains near Hurmuz, and are robbers, said to be Arabs by origin; while in the Arabic version we read: 'The inhabitants of the Qāran or Bārfe<sup>3</sup> Mountains were Zoroastrians during the rule of the Amāwī Khalīfas; they would not submit, and were more cunning than the inhabitants of the Qufṣ Mountains. They were converted under the rule of the 'Abbāsī Khalīfas.' This race is evidently the Ahwās or Hawās of Idrīsī. The Persian

<sup>1</sup> Mas'ūdī, French translation, iii. 254.

<sup>2</sup> Mordtmann's 'Istakhrī' (Hamburg, 1845, pp. 77, 78), and Ouseley's 'Ibn Haukal,' pp. 143, 146. (This is a Persian version of 'Istakhrī'.)

<sup>3</sup> The جبال الباردة, or Cold Mountains, according to Idrīsī.

version adds that Qufṣ in Arabic is the same as Koch in Persian, and that these two peoples—one in the mountains and the other in the desert—are commonly spoken of jointly as Koch and Baloch. Both versions agree in describing the Baloch as better behaved than their neighbours, and as not infesting the roads; but it is impossible to accept this statement as fact. It is perhaps due to the accidental use of a negative by a copyist, and one authority has probably reproduced it from another without question.

Istakhri also, in his account of Sijistān, gives a list of the provinces of that country, among which two (Nos. 19 and 22) are described as 'country of the Baloch' (بلوچ).<sup>1</sup> The desert infested by the Baloch seems in reality to have been not that to the south of the Karmān Mountains, but the great desert now known as the Lūt, which lies north and east of Karmān, and separates it from Khorāsān and Sistān. Idrīsi, who was a careful writer, says that the Koch Mountains were inhabited by a savage race—a sort of Kurds—while the Baloch live to the north, and some to the west of them.<sup>2</sup> He adds that they are prosperous, have much cattle, and are feared by their neighbours, and also confirms the statement that they do not infest the roads. Yākūt is in substantial agreement with Idrīsi.<sup>3</sup> He also compares the Koch to the Kurds, and quotes an Arabic poem as follows: 'What wild regions have we traversed, inhabited by Jatts (Zutt), Kurds, and savage Qufṣ!' He gives a long account of the Qufṣ, quoted from er-Rohinī, in which he traces them to pre-Islamic Arabs of Yemen, and says they have never had any religion, either pagan or Muḥammadan. He speaks of them as irreclaimable savages, and says it would be well to exterminate them. He adds that they do show some respect to 'Alī, but only out of imitation of their neighbours. This gives rise to a suspicion that they may have

<sup>1</sup> Mordtmann's 'Istakhri,' p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Jaubert's 'Edrīsi,' i. 428, 429.

<sup>3</sup> I owe the reference to Yākūt to the kindness of Mr. Ellis.

been Shīas, and that er-Rohinī had some grudge against them. Yākūt also quotes el-Bishārī as classifying the mountains of Karmān into those of the Koch, the Baloch, and the Qāran, which corresponds with the description of Istakhrī. He says that the Koch (Qufṣ) are tall, slender people, who call themselves Arabs, given to all sorts of wickedness, barbarous and cruel, and living by plunder. The Bulūṣ were formerly the most terrible of the marauding tribes, but were destroyed by Adad-u'd-daula,<sup>1</sup> who also slew a great number of the Qufṣ. They call themselves Musalmāns (this apparently refers to the Qufṣ), but are more bitter against Musalmāns than are the Greeks and Turks.

Yākūt speaks of the Baloch under a separate heading (بلوچ), and gives a more favourable account of them. He says they resemble the Kurds, live between Fārs and Karmān, and are dreaded by the savage Qufṣ, who fear no one else. The Baloch, he says, are richer and more civilized than their neighbours, live in goatskin tents, and do not plunder and fight like the Qufṣ.

In addition to Adadu'd-daula Dailamī, his uncle Mu'iz-zu'd-daula, who died A.H. 356, also came into collision with the wild tribes of Karmān, called by some Kurds and by others Koch and Baloch. He lost his left hand and the fingers of the right in conflict with them, and was thence known as Aqṭa' (أقطع), or maimed.<sup>2</sup>

The Baloch, no doubt, possessed horses and raided far afield, as their descendants have done ever since. They crossed the desert into Khorāsān and Sīstān, and the fact that two of the provinces of Sīstān were already in Istakhrī's time known as Baloch country shows that they had begun to establish themselves there. During the reign of Maḥmūd Ghaznawī they roused the wrath of that monarch by robbing his ambassador on the way to Karmān, between Tabbas and Khabīs. Maḥmūd sent his son

<sup>1</sup> The Dailamī (Buwaihī), who reigned A.H. 338-372 (A.D. 949-982).

<sup>2</sup> *Tarikh-i-Yāfaī*, quoted by Raverty, '*Tabaḳāt-i-Nāsirī*,' i. 60 (note).

Mas'ūd against them, who finally defeated them near Khabīs, which lies on the edge of the desert, at the foot of the Karmān Mountains.<sup>1</sup> On another occasion these robbers were disposed of by allowing them to capture several loads of poisoned apples, which they devoured. The chronicler approves of this as a pleasant and ingenious scheme for getting rid of them.

Firdausī, who lived at this time at Tūs, near Meshhed, in Khorāsān, must have been familiar with the name of these marauders, and this knowledge must have given point to the descriptions in the 'Shāhnāma' already alluded to. It is possible that permanent settlements may have been made by the Baloches in Khorāsān as well as in Sīstān. Even in the present day, according to Lord Curzon, there is a considerable Baloch population as far north as Turbat-i Haidarī.<sup>2</sup>

Certain it is that soon after the above-quoted accounts were written there was a wholesale migration of the Baloches from Kermān, and there is some reason to believe that before establishing themselves in Mēkrān and on the Sindh frontier they made a temporary settlement in Sīstān. Such a movement had already begun, as the names of the provinces in Sīstān given by Istakhri show; and later on the author of the 'Tabakāt-i-Nāsirī' notes that he halted in Sīstān at a place called Gumbaz-i-Baloch, a slight indication, but sufficient to show their presence in the country. There is, however, no historical evidence as to what happened to the Baloches during this period previous to their appearance in Sind, which is first mentioned in the middle of the thirteenth century.

It seems probable that there were two movements of the Baloch race in this period, each of which corresponded with a conquest affecting a great part of the Asiatic world. The first was the abandonment of Karmān and the settlement in Sīstān and Western Makrān, corresponding with

<sup>1</sup> Jāmī'u'l-hikāyāt in E. D., ii. 193, 194.

<sup>2</sup> Curzon's 'Persia,' 1892, i. 203.

the Seljūq invasion and the overthrow of the Dailamī and Ghaznawī power in Persia; the second move was to Eastern Mekrān and the Sindh border, corresponding with the invasions of Changiz Khān and the wanderings of Jalālu'ddīn Mangbarnī in Makrān.

This second movement introduced the Baloches first into the Indus Valley, and prepared the way for the third and last migration, by which a great portion of the Baloch race was precipitated into the plains of India. The last movement corresponds in its commencement with the conquests of Taimūr, and in its later developments with the invasions of India by Bābar and the Arghūns.

Although historical data are wanting, their place is to some extent supplied by tradition, which among the Baloches, especially the tribes of the Sulaiman Mountains, is full and circumstantial, and contained in numerous heroic ballads of ancient date.<sup>1</sup> The traditional narrative, as far as it possesses any value, may be said to commence with the sojourn in Sīstān. Before that the legend simply asserts that the Baloches were descended from Mir Hamza, the Prophet's uncle, and from a Pari, and that they took part in the wars of 'Alī's sons against Yazīd and fought at Kerbela. This is merely the introduction, the descent from some Muhammadan notable or from someone mentioned in the Qur-ān, which is considered necessary to every respectable Musalman race, just as the Kalhoras of Sindh and the Dāūdpotras of Bahāwalpur claim descent from 'Abbās, and the sons of Hindūs converted to Muhammadanism are called Sheikḥ, and blossom into Qureshīs of the purest blood. Between Kerbela and Sīstān there is a gap, and the settlement in the latter is really the starting-point of the legend. The Baloches are represented in the old ballads, as I have always heard the tale related, as arriving in Sīstān and being hospitably received by a King named Shamsu'd-dīn. After a time another King arose

<sup>1</sup> As far as I am aware, all the ballads of this nature have been collected among the Northern Baloches, and none in Mekrān.

named Badru'd-dīn, who persecuted and drove them out. Now, there really was a Malik of Sistān, an independent ruler of the dynasty claiming descent from the Šaffārīs, named Šamsu'd-dīn, who died in A.H. 559. He is described as a cruel tyrant, hated by his people.<sup>1</sup> It is quite possible that he may have utilized the services of the Baloches, who were certainly settled to some extent in Sistān at this time, as mercenaries to uphold his power. Badru'd-dīn is not so easily identified.

About thirty years after Šamsu'd-dīn's death Sistān became tributary to the Ghorī kings (A.H. 590), who maintained their power until Changīz Khan devastated the country, but the Maliks of Sijistān continued to rule under them. There was a Badru'd-dīn Kidānī among the Maliks of Ghiyāsu'd-dīn Ghorī, but it is impossible to say whether he ever had power in Sistān. But it seems most probable that the convulsions attending Changiz Khan's invasion forced most of the Baloch tribes out of Sistān, and also drove east any who may have still lingered in Karmān. The whole legend is by some authorities located in Karmān, and not in Sistān.<sup>2</sup> But I have never myself met with this version among the Baloches. That a great migration among the tribes took place at this period does not admit of doubt. Within thirty or forty years we read of Baloches raiding in Sindh, where they had previously been unknown.

The legend is to the effect that Badru'd-dīn demanded a bride from each of the forty-four *bolaks* of the Baloches. They pretended to agree, but sent him forty-four boys dressed as girls, and themselves marched out of the country to avoid his vengeance when the deception was discovered. He, however, sent the boys back to their

<sup>1</sup> See Raverty's 'Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī,' i. 189.

<sup>2</sup> See Hetu Ram, 'Belochī-nāma.' Trans. Douie; Lahore, p. 161, 1885. H. R. gives the name of the Baloch leader, under Šamsu'd-dīn, as Ilmash Rūmī, and that of his son, under Badru'd-dīn, as Gul Chirāgh.



families, but pursued the tribes into Kech-Makrān, and was defeated by them there. In Makrān the Baloches fought against a ruler named Hārīn or Hārūn, probably an Arab of the coast, as the place where the fight took place is named Hārīn-bandar, or the port of Hārūn. Another name in the ballads is Jagīn, which is a place on the coast of Makrān, not far from Jāsk. The original tribes of Makrān seem to have been mainly Jajṭs, and at the time of the Arab conquest they are frequently alluded to under the name of Zutt; and no doubt some Arab settlements had been made then, as now, on the coast. That some of these tribes were destroyed and others absorbed and assimilated by the Baloch invaders is extremely probable, but we are without any information as to what extent this took place. But the legendary account refers the origin of the main divisions of the Baloch race to this period. Mīr Jalāl Khān, son of Jīand, is said to have been ruler over all the Baloches. He left four sons, named Rind, Lāshār, Hot, and Korāī, and a daughter named Jato, who was married to his nephew Murād. These five are the eponymous founders of the five great divisions of the race, the Rinds, Lashārīs, Hots, Korāīs, and Jatoīs. There are, however, some tribes which cannot be brought within any of these divisions, and accordingly we find ancestors duly provided for them in some genealogies. Two more sons are added to the list—Ālī and Bulō. From Bulō are descended the Buledīs, and from Ālī's two sons, Ghazan and 'Umar, are derived the Ghazanī Marrīs and the 'Umarānīs (now scattered among several tribes). I may here note that the genealogies given in the 'Tuhfatul-Kirām<sup>1</sup> seem to be apocryphal, and are not in accordance with Baloch tradition. It is there asserted that Jalālu'd-dīn was one of fifty brothers, and that he received one-half of the inheritance, the rest taking half between them, and

<sup>1</sup> See E. D., i. 336. This is the tradition alluded to by Colonel Mockler (*J. A. S. B.*, 1895, par. i., p. 34). The 'Tuhfatul-Kirām' is a late eighteenth-century compilation.

that, while the descendants of the other brothers mingled with the people of Makrān, those of Jalālu'd-dīn came to Sindh and Kachhī, and their descendants are spread through the country. The actual tradition of the Baloches, however, represents that the tribal divisions originated in the performance of Jalāl Khān's funeral ceremonies. Rind had been appointed by his father successor to the *Phāgh* or Royal Turban, and proposed to perform the ceremonies and erect an *āsrokh*, or memorial canopy. His brother Hot, who was his rival, refused to join him, whereupon the others also refused; each performed the ceremony separately, 'and there were five *āsrokh*s in Kech.' Some of the bolaks joined one and some another, and so the five great tribes were formed. In reality it seems probable that there were five principal gatherings of clans under well-known leaders, and that they became known by some nickname or descriptive epithet, such as the Rinds ('cheats'), the Hots ('warriors'), the Lashārīs ('men of Lashār'), etc., and that these names were afterwards transferred to their supposed ancestors. The Buledhīs, or men of Boleda,<sup>1</sup> probably joined the confederacy later, and the same may be said of the Ghazanīs and Umarānīs. One very important tribe—the Dodāi—is not included in any of these genealogies, the reason being that this tribe is undoubtedly of Indian origin, and that its affiliation to the Baloch stock did not take place until the movement to Sindh had begun. To explain this it is necessary to return to the historical narrative.

Sindh was under the rule of the Rājput tribe of Somrā, which had succeeded to the power of the Arab conquerors.

<sup>1</sup> Colonel Mockler (*J. A. S. B.*, 1895, p. 35) suggests the Arabic name Budail as an origin for Bulaidī, either directly or through the town of Bulaida. This is quite possible, as such transpositions are not uncommon. It seems most probable that the tribal name comes from that of the place, which, again, may be from Budail. This name, in its original form, is not now found as a proper name among Baloches, but may be represented by the modern Bād̄hel or Bātil.

There is a long list of Somra kings in the Chronicles, no less than five of whom bore the name of Dodā. The chronology is very uncertain, but Dodā IV. seems to have reigned about the middle of the thirteenth century (A.H. 650).<sup>1</sup> In the time of his father Khafīf a body of Baloches entered Sindh, and allied themselves with two local tribes, the Sodhās and Jharejās. When Dodā IV. succeeded, the Baloches and Jharejās forsook the Sodhā alliance, and supported him. In the time of Umar, the next king, we again find the Baloches entering into a combination with the Sammās, Sodhās, and Jaṭṭs (Jharejās), but this did not last long. The Sammās made terms for themselves, and their allies had to submit, which probably means that the Baloches retired into the mountains. There is no evidence that they made any permanent settlement in the plains at this time. In the reign of Dodā V. the Somra rule was finally overthrown, and the power passed into the hands of the Sammās, who established what is known as the Jām dynasty. This event took place probably at the end of the thirteenth century, while ‘Alāu’-d-dīn Khaljī was reigning at Delhi. A story, evidently derived from popular folklore, is told in the *Tārīkh-i-M’asūmī* (written *circa* A.D. 1600) about Doda’s extraordinary adventures.<sup>2</sup> He wins the favour of Sulṭān Maudūd of Ghaznī by his power of seeing through men’s bodies, which enables him to fish out two snakes which the Sulṭān had swallowed, and is finally restored to his dominions. Possibly the legend referred originally to Dodā I., who lived while the Ghaznavī dynasty still existed (his death is placed in A.H. 485, while Mas’ūd III. was reigning).<sup>3</sup> This story begins with the escape of Dodā from his enemies and his crossing the river Indus.

<sup>1</sup> See *Tārīkh-i-M’asūmī*, E. D., i.; also E. D., i. p. 484, appendix; *Muntakhabu’t-tawārīkh*, *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> E. D., i. 221.

<sup>3</sup> Raverty, *J. A. S. B.*, 1892, p. 225 (note), says that Dodā was contemporary with ‘Abdu’r-rashīd of Ghaznī (A.H. 440). He does not mention the authority.

To turn now to the Baloch legend of the origin of the Dodāis. Dodā Somra was turned out of Thaṭha by his brethren, and escaped by swimming his mare across the Indus. He came half frozen in the morning to the hut of a Rind named Sālhe, who took him down from the mare, and, to revive him, put him under the blankets with his daughter Mudho. He afterwards married him to Mudho, and, as the ballad says, 'For the woman's sake the man became a Baloch, who had been a Jatt, a Jaghdal, a nobody; he dwelt at Harrand under the hills, and fate made him the chief of all.' His descendants were the Doḍāi tribe, which took a leading place among the Baloches in the South Panjāb, and his son Gorish gave his name to the Gorshānī, or Gurchānī, tribe.

It may be conjectured that at the break-up of the Somrā power a section of the tribe, headed by their chief Dodā, allied itself with the Baloches, who were then in Mekrān and in the mountains adjoining Sindh, and, becoming gradually assimilated, ultimately took their place as a Baloch tribe. Although they are Baloches in appearance, and speak the Balochī language, it has always been recognised that the Gurchānīs (now the principal tribe of Dodāi origin) are not of pure blood. The Mirrānīs, another Dodāi tribe long of great importance, whose chiefs were for two hundred years Nawābs of Dera Ghāzi Khan, are now broken up and decayed.

In addition to the five main tribes and the others just mentioned, there are also a few tribes of lower status which are supposed to represent the four servile *bolaks*, which were associated with the forty Baloch bolaks. These are the Gopāngs, Dashtīs, Gādhīs, Gholos, and perhaps some others. The Baloch nation, therefore, as it appeared in the fifteenth century, on the eve of the invasion of India, was made up of the following elements :

(1) The five main bodies of undoubted Baloch descent—viz., the Rind, Lashārī, Hot, Korai, Jatōi ;

(2) The groups afterwards formed in Mekrān—viz., the Budedhīs, Ghazanīs, and 'Umarānīs ;

(3) The Dodāīs ; and

(4) The servile tribes.

And since that period the Gichkīs in Mekrān, and the Jakrānīs in Sindh, seem to have been assimilated in comparatively modern times.

Nothing more is heard of the Baloches in Sindh after the fall of the Somrās for nearly a hundred and fifty years, although there may have been occasional raids which are not recorded. Their next appearance there is in the reign of Jām Tughlaq (A.D. 1423-1450), when they are recorded as raiding near Bhakhar. There was at this period a new feeling of restlessness abroad, of which Taimūr's invasion of India was the instigating cause, as the conquests of the Seljūqs and of Changīz Khān had been of the earlier movements. The remains of the once powerful Tughlaq monarchy of Dehlī disappeared, and a succession of feeble rulers allowed the Lodī Afghāns to seize the sovereignty, and opened a tempting prospect to needy adventurers from beyond the border. This led to invasions of India from three distinct sources. First, those of Baber and his Turks, so-called Mughals, which culminated in the establishment of the Mughal Empire; secondly, those of the Arghūns, headed by Shāh Beg, which established a temporary dynasty in Sindh, sweeping away the Sammā Jāms; and, thirdly, that of the Baloches, which, though it did not establish any dynasty, contributed a more important element to the population of Northern India than either of the others.

Before their final descent into India the Baloches seem to have been in occupation of the Kilāt highlands, now held by the Brahoīs. It seems at least probable that their wars with the Brahoīs had some connection with their onward movement, but their own tradition tells us nothing of it. It is commonly asserted by writers on the subject that a Hindu tribe called Sewa was in possession of Kilāt, and that they called in the services of the Brahoīs to protect them against the Baloches. Some hold the Brahōis

to be aborigines of the country, and this idea seems to be based on the fact of their language containing a strong Dravidian element, but they themselves claim, like the Baloches, to have come from Halab. It is at least a theory worthy of some consideration that they are identical with the Koch, the neighbours of the Baloch in Karmān. The Koch, as we have seen, were often described as very like the Kurds, and were sometimes even called Kurds. There is still a powerful tribe among the Brahoīs bearing the name of Kurd, or Kird, and a clan of Kirds is even found among the Baloch Mazārī. The Brahoi language is still called by the Baloches Kur-gālī, or Kir-gālī—that is, the language of the Kurds—although it has no connection with the Kurdish language, which is an Iranian dialect with some points of resemblance to Balochī. It is, however, at present impossible to do more than state, as a probability, that the Brahoīs came from the west, and that their occupation of the highlands had something to do with the Baloch descent on the plains. The separation between the Northern Baloches and those of Mekrān dates from this period.

The movement of the tribes took on this occasion a northerly direction, their objective being rather Multān and the Southern Panjāb than Sindh strictly so called.

The Rajput tribe named Langāh,<sup>1</sup> long since converted to Muhammadanism, had established an independent kingdom at Multān under their chief Rai Sehra (A.H. 847 = A.D. 1443), who took the title of Quṭbu'd-dīn. He was succeeded in A.H. 874 by his son, Shāh Husain, who reigned till A.H. 908 (A.D. 1502). It was during his reign that the first settlement of Baloches in the Panjāb was made by Malik Sohrāb Dodāī, who came to Multān with his sons Ghāzī Khān, Faṭḥ Khān, and Ismāīl Khān, and a large number of Baloches. Shāh Husain encouraged them and gave them a jāgīr extending from

<sup>1</sup> Firishta calls them Afghāns, but there seems no doubt that they were Rājputs.

Kot Karor to Dhankot, evidently on condition of military service. Other Baloches, hearing of this, came flocking in, and gradually obtained possession of the whole country between Sītpur and Dhankot—that is to say, the present district of Muzafargarh between the Indus and the Chanāb. The chief authorities for these events are Firishta's history of the Kings of Multān and the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbari*.<sup>1</sup> Firishta calls the newcomers both Dodāis and Baloches, and says that they came from Kech and Makrān. Soon after this two brothers belonging to the Sammā tribe, Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm, who had quarrelled with Jām Nanda (or Nizāmu'd-din), the Sammā ruler of Sindh, came as refugees to Shāh Husain, and also obtained jāgīrs—viz., Uchh and Shor (*i.e.*, Shorkot, now in the Jhang district). Jām Bāyazīd became a person of great influence and commander of the Shāh's armies. After Shāh Husain's death and the accession of Shāh Mahmūd he went into rebellion. A temporary reconciliation took place, but there seems to have been a good deal of friction between Malik Sohrāb Dodāi and Jām Bāyazīd. This circumstance is connected with the second settlement of Baloches under Mīr Chākar Rind, whose name is celebrated among all Baloches up to the present day.

Mīr Chākur Rind<sup>2</sup> and his son Mīrzā Shahdād (or, according to some, his two sons Shahīd and Shuhdā) came from Sīvī (Sibi) seeking service and lands. Malik Sohrāb Dodāi, out of jealousy, prevented Shāh Mahmūd from accepting his services; whereupon Jām Bāyazīd took up his cause, and assigned him lands from his own jāgīr of Uchh. According to the legends, Mīr Chakur had two sons named Shahzād and Shaihak. Shahzād was of miraculous origin, his mother having been overshadowed by some mysterious

<sup>1</sup> E. D., v. 470.

<sup>2</sup> The name is variously written. Briggs, in his translation, gives Mīr Jakar Zand; the lithographed Lucknow edition of Firishta gives میر حماد کروڑی; while the British Museum MS., No. 6572, Or. f. 614, gives it as میر چلو کردن. The *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī* (in E. D., iv. 389-397) gives Chākur Rind correctly.

power. A mystical poem in Balochi on the origin of Multān is attributed to him, as well as one on the sack of Dehlī. It is remarkable that Shahdād is said by Firishta to have been the first to introduce the Shī'a creed into Multān. The rivalry between the Rinds (Chākur's tribe) and the Dodaīs is also the subject of many poems.

Other poems, forming the bulk of the legendary ballads, deal with the war which took place between the Rinds and Lashāris and also between both of them and the Turks, and assert that it was the loss of Sibi and Kachhī which forced Mīr Chākur and his Rinds to migrate to the Panjāb. To understand the true meaning of these legends it is necessary to go back to the invasion of Sindh by the Arghūns—the Turks of the Baloch story. The Arghūns were a Mughal family who claimed descent from Changīz Khān. Zu'n-nūn Beg Arghūn rose to power as Minister under Sultān Husain Baikara of Herat, one of the descendants of Taimūr. He obtained the Government of Qandahār, where he made himself practically independent. The first invasion of Kachhī, by way of the Bolān Pass, took place in A.H. 890 (A.D. 1485). Shāh-Beg commanded on behalf of his father, and penetrated as far as the Indus; Jām Nanda, the Summā Chief, opposed him and defeated and drove him back at Jalūgīr in A.D. 1486.<sup>1</sup> After Zu'n-nūn Beg's death in war against the Uzbegs, Shah Beg, who succeeded him, was driven out of Qandahār by Bābar in A.D. 1507, and took refuge in Shāl and Mustang at the head of the Bolan Pass, where he must have come into contact with the Baloches. Shah Beg ultimately lost Qandahār, and determined to build up a new throne for himself in India. He invaded Sindh in A.H. 917 (A.D. 1511) and A.H. 927 (A.D. 1520), overthrew the Sammās, and established his power.<sup>2</sup> He enlisted the services of some of the hill-tribes, probably Baloches, and we also read of

<sup>1</sup> For a good sketch of the history of this period, see General Haig's 'The Indus Delta Country,' 1894, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See also Erskine's 'Lives of Bābar and Humāyūn,' 1854, i. 352, etc.; and the *Tarīkh-i-M'asūmī* in E. D., i. 236.



a force of 3,000 Baloches serving under Jām Feroz ; so that it is probable that rival Baloch tribes fought on opposite sides. This is borne out by Baloch legend as to the rivalry between the Rinds and Lashārīs, in which the Turks under Zunū (Zu'n-nūn Beg) and the King of Sibi, Jām Nindā, play an important part.<sup>1</sup> The Rinds were under Mīr Chākūr, and the Lashārīs under Gwaharām, who were rivals for the hand of the fair Gohar, the owner of large herds of camels. Gohar preferred Mīr Chākūr, and this led to a quarrel. A horse-race, in which the Rinds are stated to have won by trickery, precipitated the outbreak. Some Lashārīs killed some of Gohar's young camels, and Chākūr thereupon swore revenge. A desperate war began, which lasted for thirty years. At first the Rinds were defeated, and they seem to have called on the Turks for aid, but after various fluctuations Chākūr with most of his Rinds left Sibi, and made for the Panjāb. The Lashārīs remained at Gandāva, and some Rinds maintained their position at Shorān, both places not far from Sibi in the plain of Kachhī. These events constitute the Iliad of the Baloch race, and form the subject of numerous picturesque ballads which have been handed down verbally to the present day.<sup>2</sup>

It has been shown above how Mīr Chākūr arrived at Multān, and how the rivalry arose between the Rinds and the Dodāīs. The legendary lore deals with this subject also, and it is stated that Chākūr joined Humāyūn afterwards on his march to Dehlī, and at last settled down at Satgarha (in the Montgomery District of the Panjāb). His tomb still exists there, and there is a considerable Rind

<sup>1</sup> One ballad represents Chākūr as taking refuge with Sultān Shah Husain of Harev (*i.e.*, Sultān Husain of Herāt).

<sup>2</sup> Some of these I published with a translation in my 'Sketch of the Northern Balochi Language' (*J. A. S. B.*, extra number, 1881), and others in 'The Adventures of Mīr Chākūr,' included in Temple's 'Legends of the Punjāb,' vol. ii. Others have been printed and translated by the Rev. T. J. L. Mayer (Fort Munro and Agra, 1900 and 1901).

settlement in the neighbourhood. In the *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī* of 'Abbās Khan, a valuable authority, we find Chākūr Rind established at Satgarha in Sher Shāh's time,<sup>1</sup> and the Baloches in possession of the whole Multān country, from which Sher Shah expelled them. It is evident that they would have been on this account disposed to join Humāyūn in his expedition to recover his kingdom from the Afghāns, and although there is no historical evidence of the fact, the legend makes it very probable that they did so.

It is not very clear how the Baloches came to be in complete possession of the Multān country. Shāh Beg Arghūn, after overthrowing the Sammās of Sindh, turned his arms against the Langāhs of Multān, and was opposed at Uchh by an army of Baloches and Langāhs. He was victorious, and advanced on Multān in A.H. 931 (A.D. 1524) where Shāh Mahmūd Langāh was reigning. The army which opposed him is said to have been composed of Baloch, Jat, Rind, Dodāi and other tribes.<sup>2</sup> The Shāh was poisoned by Sheikh Shujā', his son-in-law, and the historian says: 'The army, which consisted chiefly of Baloches, being thus deprived of its head, the greatest confusion reigned.' The son of the deceased king was placed on the throne, but the place fell into the hands of the Arghūns.<sup>3</sup> The conquest of Dehli by Bābar followed almost immediately, and Shāh Beg admitted his supremacy.

It is evident that the Baloches were in great force in the South Panjāb at this period, and they were in complete possession of the country, as has been seen, in Sher Shāh's time. The Rinds seem to have spread up the valleys of

<sup>1</sup> E. D., iv. 399, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Tarkhān-nāma in E. D., i. 314. Dodāi should evidently be read for Dādi.

<sup>3</sup> Darmesteter ('Chants des Afghanes,' p. 172) mixes up the Arghuns and the Baloch. He says: 'Elle (*i.e.*, la dynastie des Langāhs) est renversée par la dynastie bélucie des Arghūns, et la tribu des Langāhs est exterminée.' The Langāh tribe still exists in the neighbourhood of Leia.

the Chenāb, the Rāwī, and the Satlaj, and the Dodāīs and Hots up the Indus and the Jehlam. Bābar found the Baloches, as he states in his autobiography, as early as A.D. 1519 at Bhera and Khushāb; and it may be inferred that these were Dodāīs, for when Sher Shāh arrived at Khushāb in A.D. 1546, in pursuit of Humāyūn, he was met by the three sons of Sohrāb Khan—viz., Ismāīl Khān, Faṭḥ Khān, and Ghāzī Khān—and he confirmed to them the 'country of Sindh,' by which must be understood Sindh in the local use of the word—that is, the lands lying along the Indus, the Derajāt, where these brothers had formed settlements.<sup>1</sup> The three towns of Dera Ismā'īl Khān, Dera Ghāzī Khān, and Dera Faṭḥ Khān still bear their names, and Ghāzī Khān's tomb is at the village of Churaṭṭā, near Dera Ghāzī Khān. The date is lost, but it bears an inscription of Akbar's time. Ismāīl Khān had to give up the lands belonging to a holy man named Sheikh Bāyazīd Sarwānī, of which he had been in possession since the time of the Langūhs, and received in exchange the pargana of Ninduna in the Ghakhar country.<sup>2</sup>

In Akbar's time there are occasional notices of expeditions against the Baloches. They do not seem to have entered his military service as the Persians, Mughals, and Afghāns did, and Baloch names are conspicuous by their absence in the list of *mansabdārs* in the *Āin-i-Akbarī*, in which only one name occurs—viz., Pahār Khān Baloch, commander of two hundred. Even this name is not Balochī in origin.

After the Rinds had left Kachhī the Lashārīs seem to have accompanied Shāh Beg Arghūn and his successor Shah Husain in his wars against Jām Feroz, whom he pursued towards Gujarāt, as the legend represents them as invading Gujarāt, and afterwards returning to Kachhī and obtaining a grant of Gundāva from the king. The

<sup>1</sup> *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī*, E. D., iv. 388.

<sup>2</sup> The author of the '*Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī*,' who records this, was grandson of Sheikh Bāyazīd.

Maghassī tribe, a branch of the Lashārīs, still occupy that neighbourhood. Other Lashārīs must have joined the invaders of the Panjāb, as a strong Lashāri clan is still attached to the Gurchānīs (Dodāīs), and the Jistkānis, a clan of the Lashārīs, established a principality at Mankera, in the Sindh-Sāgar Doāb. In fact, the early successes of the Rinds and Dodāīs seem to have led to something like a national migration. The poems describe it in picturesque language :

‘The noble Rinds were in Bampūr, in the groves of Kech and Makrān, with the Dombkīs, the greatest house among the dwellings of the Baloches. The Rinds and Lashārīs made a bond together and said : “Come, let us leave this barren land ; let us spy out the running streams and sweet waters, and distribute them among us ; let us take no heed of tribe or chief.” They came to their homes, the chiefs called to their slaves, “Loose the slender chestnut mares from their stalls, saddle the young fillies—steeds worth nine thousand—drive in the camels from the passes.” The warriors called to their wives : “Come ye down from your castles, bring out your beds and wrappings, carpets and red blankets, pillows and striped rugs, cups cast in the mould, and drinking-vessels of Makrān ; for Chākūr will no longer abide here, but seeks a far land.” So the generous Rinds rode forth in their overcoats and long red boots, with helmets and armpieces, bows and quivers, silver knives and daggers—forty thousand of them rode at the Mīr’s call.’

So they swarmed down into the plains, seizing the fertile lands and grazing-grounds, and always, if possible, keeping near to a screen of hills as a shelter.<sup>1</sup> Some tribes wandered far afield. Among the first must have been the Chāndyas, who gave their name to the tract known as

<sup>1</sup> The extent of the migration may be judged from the fact that a recent census (1891) showed 985,000 Baloches in Sind and the Panjab. Only 80,000 have been enumerated in the Kelāt territory, while the figures for Mekran and Persian Balochistan, not accurately known, may be roughly put at 200,000.

Chāndko along the Indus, just where the Panjāb and Sindh meet. The Hots pressed northwards, and settled with the Dodāis at Dera Ismail Khān, which they held for two hundred years, until deprived of it by Pathāns; and the Kulāchīs founded the town which bears their name near by. It now belongs to the Gandāpur Afghāns, but the Kulāchīs still inhabit the countryside. The Jistkānis, as has been seen, settled in the sandy waste of the central Sindh-Sagar Doāb, and south of them the Mirrānī Dodāis, who were also Nawābs of Dera Ghāzi Khān till the time of Nādir Shāh. Mazārīs are still found at Chatta Bakhshā in Jhang. The Rinds are in large numbers in the districts of Multān, Jhang, Muẓafargarh, Montgomery, and Shāhpur; the Jatois and Korāis are spread over the same districts, while the Gopāngs and Gurmānis are concentrated in Muẓafargarh. These represent the descendants of the tribes which followed Mīr Chākūr, but others stayed behind, and some are said to have turned back from Tulumbā in Multān and recrossed the Indus, wishing to keep near the mountains. Chākūr is said to have incited the Dodāis to attack the tribes that refused to follow him, and this war is also the subject of many ballads. The tribes which remained on the right bank of the Indus are those which have retained their language and their tribal constitution, while the rest have in varying degrees become assimilated to their Jatt and Rājput neighbours; and as those who speak Balochī say: 'Those who followed Chākūr have become Jatts, while those who stayed behind have remained Baloches.' And this also explains the prominence obtained by the Rinds. The Hots, Jatois, and Korāis passed on, and their descendants are found scattered, as I have already stated. Most of the Lashāris stayed behind in Mēkrān or Kachhī. But the organized tūmans, which remain to the present day in the Sulaimāns and the Derajat—viz., the

Marri,

Bughtī (including Shambānī),

Mazārī,

Drīshak,  
Lund (two tumans),  
Leghārī,  
Khosa,  
Nutkānī,  
Bozdar,  
Kasrānī

—are mainly Rinds ; while one—viz., the

Gurchānī

—is Dodāī, with Rind and Lashārī clans attached to it. Of the tribes in Kachhī and Northern Sindh, the following are Rinds :

Rind (of Shoran), including the  
Ghulām Bolak of Sibi,  
Dombkī, Umarānī,  
Khosa, Chandya.

The Maghassī are Lashāris, the Buledhī (or Burdī) a separate Baloch stem, and the Jakrānī assimilated Jatt; the Kahīrī, possibly Sayyids by origin, also now assimilated.

The Buledhī seem to have accompanied the Rinds into the Sulaimān Hills ; and there the country, now occupied in part by Marrīs, Bughtīs, and Gurchānīs, was long a bone of contention between them and the Gorgezh Rinds, and probably the Kalmatī, too. The struggle between Gorgezh and Buledhī forms the subject of song and legend.<sup>1</sup> After they were expelled from the hills they settled near the Indus, where they had many wars with the Mazārī Rinds. Their country is known as Burdika. One of the songs attributed to Bālāch Gorgezh in his war with the Buledhīs is worth quoting, as it expresses the very spirit of the Baloch of the mountains :

‘The mountains are the Baloches’ forts ; these hills are better than an army. The lofty heights are our comrades, the pathless gorges our friends. Our drink is from the flowing springs, our cups the leaf of the phīsh, our beds

<sup>1</sup> See the story of ‘Bālāch and the Buledhīs in Folklore,’ 1893, p. 200.

the thorny brush, the ground our pillow. My horse is my white sandals. For my sons you may take the arrows, for my brethren the broad shield, for my father the wide-wounding sword.'

The Gorgezh have also passed away from the country where this struggle took place, and only a fragment of the tribe is now found at Thalī, near Sibi. The Kalmatīs afterwards held the country, and were succeeded by the Hasanī, who were broken up about seventy years ago by a combination between the Marrīs and Bughtīs. Only a small body of Hasanīs now remains as a clan among the Khetrāns. The deserted villages of the Hasanīs may still be seen on the plan of Nesāo.

The settlement of the Baloches in Sindh was very extensive, and perhaps a quarter of the population of that country claims Baloch descent, but, like those settled in the Panjāb plains, they are more or less assimilated to their Indian neighbours. The Tālpur (properly Tālbūr) Amīrs who ruled Sindh after the overthrow of the Kalhoras, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, are believed to be descended from a branch of the Leghārīs of Chotī, near Dera Ghazi Khān, where there is still a Tālbūr phallī.<sup>1</sup> They seem to have been in a humble position when they first came to Sindh, nor is the Leghārī phallī one of any importance. The name occurs in a fragment of an old ballad in a list of servile tribes, said to have been presented by Mīr Chākūr to his sister Bānarī as a wedding portion, and set free by her :

'The Kirds, Gabols, Gadahīs, the Tālburs, and the Marrīs of Kāhan, all were Chākūr's slaves, and he gave them as a dowry to Bānarī on the day of washing her head (*i.e.*, seven days after the wedding) ; but she set them free, and would not accept the gift in God's name.'

Leech gives another version of this, including a tribe

<sup>1</sup> See the interesting account, by Mīr Nasīr Khān Tālpur, of Haidarābād, in Eastwick's 'Dry Leaves from Young Egypt,' 1851, Appendix VI. Also General Haig's 'Indus Delta Country,' pp. 121, 122.

named Pachālo, and a third version adds 'the rotten-boned Bozdārs'; but evidently a rhyme like this is liable to be varied according to the prepossessions of the reciter. Leech's version, however, was obtained at Kalāt fifty years before mine, and my two versions were obtained from different tribes, so that it is probable that the names, in which all agree, are old. The word 'tālbur' means 'wood-cutter,' from *tāl*, 'a branch,' and *bur-agh*, 'to cut.' A Lund bard, with a great command of genealogies, traces Mir Bijar Khān Tālpur to an eponymic Tālpur, grandson of Bulo, which would make them Buledhīs in origin; but, as already stated, the Amīrs themselves considered that they were Leghāris.

Most of the clans which took part in the great migration left some of their members behind, and in Mekrān at the present day are found Rinds, Lashārīs, Hots, Gishkaurīs, and Buledīs. The great Naushīrvānī tribe may perhaps be classed as Baloch, although generally stated to be Persians. The Buledīs retained for long an important position as the ruling race in Mekrān, but in the early eighteenth century they were displaced by the Gichkīs, a tribe said to be of Indian origin, and variously stated to be descended from Sikhs or Rājputs. They are now classed as Baloches, and speak the Balochī language. This affords a later instance of assimilation, of the same nature as that which took place with regard to the Dodāīs in earlier times.

But little detailed information as to the Baloch tribes of Mekrān<sup>1</sup> is to be gathered from the accounts of travellers.<sup>2</sup> As to Sistān also, accounts are vague and contradictory

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, Mekran was not included in the scope of the census of 1901, and Mr. Hughes-Buller's report, issued in 1902, does not give any details as to the tribes of this province.

<sup>2</sup> The best accounts are those of St. John in 'Eastern Persia,' 1876; Bellew (regarding Sistān) in 'From the Indus to the Tigris,' 1874; Goldsmid (in 'Eastern Persia'); Ferrier ('Caravan Journeys'); and Pottinger (1816). There is nothing in the works of Macgregor or Floyer. Major Molesworth Sykes has lately paid attention to this subject.



It is, however, generally admitted that the Baloches hold a position of great importance there, though not considered aboriginal. Ferrier, however, thought that the Baloches were the aborigines of Sīstān, and classed them as follows:

Nervuis (Nahrīcīs),

Rinds,

Meksīs (*i.e.*, Maghassīs),

and he also includes the Sarbandīs as Baloches; but this seems doubtful. The Sanjarānī or Tokī are, all agree, an important Baloch tribe, but it is left doubtful whether the Mamassānīs are Baloch or Brahūī. The Shahrkīs and Sarbandīs are said to have been brought into Sīstān by Nādir Shāh, but that is no reason for holding them non-Baloch; and the name of the Shahrkī chief, Mīr Chākar, certainly points to a Baloch origin.

It cannot evidently be asserted that any of the Baloch tribes now in Sīstān have maintained their position ever since the first settlement there. It is more probable that they are later immigrants from Mekrān or Persian Balochistan.

It is not my object at present to go at length into the later history of the Baloches. I hope that I have succeeded in giving some idea of their origin and wanderings, and in showing how they came to occupy the positions they now hold. Briefly, the conclusions I have come to are as follows:

1. That the Baloches are an Irānian race, judging by their physical and mental characteristics, and that they should be classed with the Tajiks and other original races of the Irānian tableland.

2. That historically they may be traced first to the north of Persia, in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, in the time of the later Sassanians.

3. That their settlement in Kermān probably did not take place till after the Muhammadan Conquest, and that in Sīstān not before the beginning of the tenth century.

4. That the movement into Sīstān and Western Mekrān

was probably caused by the Seljūq invasion, and that the further advance eastwards was due to the pressure of Changīz Khān's conquests.

5. That the final move into the Indus Valley took place during the period of unrest and disruption of governments which followed on Taimūr's conquests, and that it synchronized with the invasions of India by Bābar and the Arghūns.

It may be added that the Baloch settlement in Sindh and the South-West Panjab has profoundly affected the mass of the population beyond the limits of the tribes which are nominally Baloch. Traces of Baloch blood are frequently met with among the Jats and Rajputs, who are Musalman by religion; and not only among them, but even among the commercial Hīndū population in the Trans-Indus tracts, where Baloch features are strikingly common in Aroras of the villages and smaller towns.

In Appendix I. I give a list of the clans, or bolaks, mentioned in the early heroic poems, with some notes as to their present distribution, and also of the more important tribes not so mentioned.

Appendix II. contains a list of the organized tumans now existing, with the clans of which they are made up, and, in some cases, the phallis or septs also.

Appendix III. consists of genealogies derived from the legends, and from verbal statements of Baloches who are reputed among their people to have a good knowledge of such matters. My principal authorities have been Ghulām Muhammad, Bālāchānī Mazārī, of Rojhān; Bagā, Shalamānī Lashārī (Gurchānī), of the Sham; and Ahmad Khān Ludhiānī, Gadharoānī Lund, of Rohrī. The Marri pedigree is abstracted from the very full tree given by Colonel O. T. Duke in his 'Report on Thal-Chotiāli and Harnai' (Calcutta: Foreign Department Press, 1883). Pedigrees of the descent of the Talpur Amīrs of Sindh from the Leghārī Talpurs will be found in Eastwick's 'Dry Leaves from Young Egypt,' London, 1851.

## APPENDIX I.

I. CLANS, or bolaks, named in early poetry, with particulars as to present distribution.

*Bulmat*.—Mentioned in one poem as at war with the *Kal-matī*. Not now known.

*Chāndya*.—Now found chiefly in Upper Sindh, in the tract known as *Chandūkā* or *Chāndko*. Part of this tract is held by *Mazārīs*. *Chāndyas* are also numerous in the districts of *Muzafargarh* and *Dera Isma'īl Khān*. There is a *Chāndya* clan in the *Leghārī* tribe—*Dera Ghāzī Khān*.

*Dashtī*.—Mentioned as a servile tribe. Now found scattered in small numbers through *Dera Ghāzī Khān*, *Dera Isma'īl Khān*, and *Muzafargarh*.

*Dodāī*.—This once important tribe is not now found under this name. Its most important representatives are the *Mirṣānī* of *Dera Ghāzī Khān*, *Dera Isma'īl Khān*, and *Jhang*, and the *Gurchānī* tribe, of which the most important part, including the *Shaihakānī*, *Hotwānī*, *Khalilānī* and *Alkānī* *Durkānī* clans, is of *Dodāī* descent.

*Dombkī*, or *Domkī*.—Said in the ballads to be the 'greatest house among the Baloch.' *Chākūr* speaks of them as great in 'guftār'—i.e., song or speech—and they are still called the 'Daptar,' or recorders of Baloch genealogy. Owing to this fact and the similarity of name, some accuse them of being *Doms*; but their high rank, admitted by all, seems to preclude this idea. A satirical *Gurchānī* bard says: 'The *Dombkīs* are little brothers of the *Doms*.' Their present headquarters are at *Lehrī* in *Kachhī*. Their name is said by some to be derived from a river in Persia named *Dumbak*.

*Drīshak*.—Now an organized tribe in Dera Ghāzī Khān. Headquarters at Āsnī. Said to be descended from a companion of Chākūr, nicknamed 'Drīshak,' or 'strong,' from holding up a roof that threatened to collapse on some Lashārī women who were prisoners. Possibly connected with Dizak in Mekrān.

*Gabol*.—A servile tribe, now of small importance. Found mainly in Muẓafargaṛh.

*Golo, or Gholā*.—A servile tribe; said to have fought against Chākūr; now the principal clan among the Buledhī.

*Gopāng*.—A servile tribe, now scattered through Muẓafargaṛh, Multān, Derā Ghāzī Khān, and Kachhī, chiefly the former.

*Gorgezh*.—A branch of the Rinds, formerly of great power, but much reduced through their wars with the Buledhī; now found at Thalī in Sibi, and considered a clan of the Dombkī tribe.

*Hot*.—One of the original main sections of the Baloch. Very widely spread. They form a powerful tribe still in Mekrān, and ruled at Derā Isma'īl Khān for two hundred years. Part of the Khosa tribe and the Bālāchānī Mazārīs are said to be of Hot descent. They are found also wherever the Baloches have spread, and are numerous in Derā Isma'īl Khān, Muẓafargaṛh, Multān, and Jhang. Name sometimes wrongly spelt Hūt.

*Jatoī*.—One of the original main sections. Not now an organized tribe, but found wherever the Baloches have spread, chiefly in Muẓafargaṛh, Montgomery, Dera Ghāzī Khān, Dera Isma'īl Khān, Jhang, Shāhpur, and Lahore; also in Northern Sindh, near Shikārpur.

*Jisthānī*.—Formerly a powerful tribe in the Sindh Sāgar Doāb, with headquarters at Mankera, and still numerous there. Found as a clan in the Gurchānī and Drīshak tribes. Believed to be a branch of the Lashārīs.

*Kalmat, or Kalmatī*.—Formerly of great importance, and fought with the Marīs; now found at Pāsnī in Mekrān, and in Sindh. A Levitical tribe, probably non-Baloch. Derived either from Khalmat in Mekrān or from the Karmatī (Karmatian) heretics.

*Kird, or Kurd*.—The name of a powerful Brahoi tribe. Found as a clan in the Mazārī tribe. Mentioned in

a ballad as one of the slave tribes given by Chakar to Bānarī, his sister, and set free by her.

*Khosa*.—A very important tribe forming two distinct tumans—one near Jacobabad in Upper Sindh, and the other with its headquarters at Bātil, near Dera Ghāzī Khān. Also a sub-tuman of the Rinds of Shorān, and a clan of the Lunds of Tibbī. Said to be mainly of Hot descent. The Isānī clan of the Dera Ghāzī Khān tribe is of Khetran origin, and the small Jajelā clan, probably aboriginals of the Jaj Valley, which they inhabit.

*Korāi*.—One of the main original sections; not now an organized tuman, but found wherever the Baloches have spread in the Panjāb, principally in Muzafargarh, Multān, and Dera Isma‘īl Khān. Still form a tribe in Mekrān (spelt by some Kaudāi).

*Lashārī*.—One of the main original sections, said to have settled in Gandāva after the war with the Rinds, and to be now represented by the Maghasīs of Jhal in Kachhī. Some Lashārīs in Kachhī keep their own name, and form the largest clan of the Maghasī tribe. Others are found in Mekrān and Sīstān, where they are identified with the Maghasīs. The Jistkānīs also are of Lashārī descent. There is a strong sub-tuman of Lashārīs in the Gurchānī tribe, and other Lashārīs of Drigrī in Dera Ghāzī Khān are apparently Jajts, and Lashārīs only in name. Lashārīs are found wherever the Baloches settled in the Panjāb, chiefly in Dera Ghāzī Khān, Dera Isma‘īl Khān, Muzafargarh, and Multān.

*Mazārī*.—An organized tribe of importance, with its headquarters at Rojhān, in the south of Dera Ghāzī Khāns. The ruling clan, the Bālāchānī, are said to be Hots, and the remainder of the tribe, with the exception of the Kirds, Rinds. The name is apparently derived from *Mazār*, ‘tiger,’ like the Pathān ‘Mzarai.’

*Mīrālī*.—Recorded as having fought with the Rinds against the Lashārīs. Probably identical with the Mehrālī clan of the Rinds of Kachhī; sometimes identified with the Buledhī.

*Namurdī*.—Not now found except as a phallī in the Bozdar tribe.

*Noh, Nuhānī*.—Not now found. Said to have been on the side of the Lashārīs against the Rinds.

*Phuzh*.—A clan of Rinds to which belonged Bijar, one of

Chākūr's companions. They were of great importance, and the name is said by some to be an old name of the whole Rind tribe. Now found at Kolānch, in Mēkrān, and in small numbers in Kachhī, or near the Bolān, but not elsewhere. The Bijarānī Marrīs are supposed to be descended from Bijar Phuzh.

*Rashkānī*.—Mentioned once, probably as a subsection only. Now found only in small numbers near Quetta, and classed as a clan of the Rinds. There is a large Brahoi tribe of Rakshānī.

*Rind*.—The most important of the main divisions of the Baloches, and sometimes loosely used to include others. Most of the tribes of Rind descent are known by their distinctive names, but the Rinds of Mand in Mēkrān and Shorān in Kachhī adhere to the name Rind, which is also used by large numbers of Baloches outside the tumans in Dera Ghāzī Khān, Dera Isma'īl Khan, Muzafargarh, Multān, Jhang, Shāhpur, and Montgomery. The Ghulām Bolak of Sibi is a clan of Rinds. There is also a Rind clan in the Lund tribe of Tibbi in Dera Ghāzī Khān.

II. To this list the following names may be added of tribes not mentioned in the ancient poems, but now of importance.

#### ORGANIZED TUMANS.

*Bughtū*.—A tribe made up of various elements, mainly of Rind origin, having its headquarters at Syahāf (also called Dera Bibrak and Bughtī Dera), in the angle of the Sulaimān Mountains, between the Indus and Kachhī. Said to be descended from Gyāndār, cousin of Mīr Chākūr. Gyāndār's son, Raheja, is said to have given his name to the Raheja clan, but the name appears to be of Indian origin. The Nothānī clan have Levitical powers. The Shambānī are a sub-tuman, sometimes considered distinct from the Bughtī.

*Buledhī* (Buledī, Bulethī, Burdī).—Derived from Boleda, in Mēkrān, and long the ruling race until ousted by the Gichkī. Found also near the Indus in Upper Sindh, in the tract called Burdika, and in the Kachhī territory of Kalāt.

*Bozdār*.—A tribe living in the Sulaiman Mountains, north of Dera Ghāzī Khān. Probably partly of Rind descent. The name means 'goatherd.'

*Gurchānī*.—A tribe of mixed origin, having its headquarters at Lālgarh, near Harrand, in Dera Ghāzī Khān. The principal part of the tribe is Dodai (*q.v.*). The Syāhphādh Durkānī are Rinds; the Pitāfi, Jogānī, and Chāng probably partly Rind; the Lashārī sub-tuman (except the Gabols and Bhands) and the Jistkānī are Lashārīs; the Suhriānī and Holawānī are Bulethis. This seems to be the composition of this tribe. There is a Gurchānī clan among the Lunds of Sorī.

*Hasanī*.—A tribe of uncertain origin, which at one time occupied a considerable part of the country now held by the Marrīs. They were destroyed in wars with the Marrīs, and a fragment only remains, now forming a clan among the Khetrans, near the Han Pass. Colonel O. T. Duke considers that they were Pathāns by origin, but it seems probable that they were, like the Khetrans, an aboriginal Indian tribe, but more thoroughly assimilated by the Baloches. The remaining Hasanīs speak Balochī, not Khetrānī.

*Jakrānī*.—A tribe now in Kachhī and North Sindh. Probably of Jatt origin, though some deduce them from Gyāndār (see under Bughtī). There is a Syāhphādh clan among them, probably of Rind origin (see under Gurchānī). They are said to admit the supremacy of the Rind Chief of Shorān. Ahmad Khan derives the Jakrānīs from Gyāndār, the ancestor of the Bughtīs (Appendix III., v.).

*Kahīrī*.—A small tribe in Kachhī, now classed as Baloch, but probably non-Baloch in origin. Mentioned in the Tārīkh-i-Mʿasūmī (A.D. 1600). The author derives the name from the Kahīr-tree (*Prosopis spicigera*), which was ridden as a horse by one of their ancestors (E. D., i., p. 238).

*Kasrānī*.—Sometimes written Qaisarānī, as it is supposed to be a patronymic from Qaisar, but always pronounced Kasrānī. The most northerly of all the organized tumans, occupying part of the Sulaiman Mountains and the adjoining plains in Dera Ghāzī Khān and Dera Ismaʿīl Khān. Of Rind descent.

*Leghārī*.—An important tribe, with its headquarters at Choṭī, in Dera Ghāzī Khān. Also found in Sindh. The name is derived from 'Leghār,' dirty, and various legends are told to explain it. The ancestor Koh-phrosh, whose name was changed to Leghār, was by descent a Rind. The principal part of the tribe is

descended from him. The Chāndya clan is separate, and the Haddiānī and Kaloīs, the sub-tuman of the mountains, are said to be of Bozdār origin.

*Lund.*—A large tribe divided into two tumans, both in Dera Ghāzi Khān—the Lunds of Sorī and the Lunds of Tibbī. Both claim descent from Ālī, son of Rehān, Mīr Chākūr's cousin. The Sorī Lunds are a large tribe living in the plains, with their headquarters at Kot Kandiwala. This tribe contains a clan of Gurchānīs. The Tibbī Lunds are a small tribe with a clan of Lunds and one of Khosas, to which a third clan, called Rind, but of impure blood, is also attached.

*Marri.*—One of the best known among Baloch tribes for their marauding propensities. Of composite origin. The Ghazanī section are supposed to be descended from Ghazan, son of Ālī, son of Jalāl Khan, and the Bijarānīs from Bijar, who revolted against Mīr Chākūr. The Mazārānīs are said to be of Khetrān origin, and the Loharānīs of mixed descent. No doubt some Jātts, and also some Kalmatis, Buledhīs, and Hasanīs have been absorbed, and perhaps some Pathān elements also among the Bijarānīs.

*Rāisānī.*—A powerful Brahoi tribe, said by some Baloches to be of Baloch descent, and traced to Rāīs, cousin of Mīr Chākūr. This genealogy is, perhaps, only due to the similarity of name.

*Shambānī.*—A small tribe, sometimes classed as a clan of the Bughtī occupying the hill country adjacent to the Bughtī and Mazārī tribes. Traced, like the Lunds, to Rehān, cousin of Mīr Chākūr.

*Umarānī.*—A small tribe in Kachhī, and also a clan or sept of the Maghassī, Marri, Lund, and Khosa tribes.

*Zarkānī.*—Another name for the Bughtī (*q.v.*). It is noticeable that a neighbouring Kākar Pathān clan (of Kolū) bears the name Zarkān.

#### TRIBES NOT ORGANIZED AS TUMANS.

*Ahmdānī.*—A tribe formerly of importance, with its headquarters at Mānā, in Dera Ghāzī Khān. There is also a large Ahmdānī clan among the Sorī Lunds, and among the Haddiānī Leghārīs. The Mānā Ahmdānīs are said to descend from Gyāndār (see Appendix III., v.).

*Gishkhaurī.*—Now found scattered in Dera Isma'īl Khān and Muẓafargarh, also in Mekrān. Said to be descended



from one of Chākūr's companions, nicknamed Gishkhour, who was a Rind. The name appears to be really derived from the Gishkhour, name of a torrent in the Boleda Valley, Mēkrān, so this tribe is probably of common descent with the Buledhī. There is a Gishkhaurī sept among the Lashārī sub-tuman of the Gurchānī, and a clan among the Dombkī.

*Talpur, or Talbur.*—The well-known tribe to which the Amīrs of Sindh belonged, still represented by the Mīrs of Khairpur. Identified by themselves, and by most other accounts, with the Tālbur clan of the Leghārīs, but by some derived from an eponymic Talbur, grandson of Bulo, and hence supposed to be of common origin with the Buledhīs.

*Pitāfī.*—Of uncertain origin. Found in considerable numbers in Dera Isma'īl Khan and Muẓafargarh, and as a clan of the Gurchānīs in Dera Ghāzī Khān.

*Nutkānī, or Nodhakānī.*—A compact tribe, which till quite lately was organized as a tuman, occupying the country of Sangarh, north of Dera Ghāzī Khān.

*Kulāchī.*—Probably derived from Kolānch, in Mēkrān. They accompanied the Dodāīs and Hots, and settled near Dera Isma'īl Khan. The town of Kulāchī still bears their name, and they are most numerous in that neighbourhood. There seems some probability that they were a branch of the Dodāī.

*Gurmānī.*—This tribe is scattered through Dera Ghāzī Khān, Dera Isma'īl Khan, and Muẓafargarh, but nothing is known of its history.

*Mashorī.*—An impure race, now found mainly in Muẓafargarh. There is a Masori clan among the Bughtī, but there is probably nothing in common between them.

*Mastoi.*—Probably one of the servile tribes, though not mentioned in old poems. Found mainly in Dera Ghāzī Khān, where they have no social status.

*Kupchānī.*—Mainly in Dera Isma'īl Khan.

*Sanjārānī* } In Dera Ghāzī Khān.  
*Hajānī* }

*Suhrānī.*—In Muẓafargarh.

*Laskānī.*—In Muẓafargarh, Dera Ghāzī Khān, and Dera Isma'īl Khān.

*Qandrānī.*—In Muẓafargarh.

*Kaloṛ.*—Found as a clan among the Leghārīs of Dera Ghāzī Khān and the Kachhī Rinds.

## APPENDIX II.

### ORGANIZED TRIBES OR TUMANS.

THE following list of tribes still organized as tumans, with their clans, and, wherever possible, their septs or sub-sections, has been compiled from various sources. For the information regarding the tribes of the Dera Ghāzī Khān district and the adjoining hill country I am mainly responsible, but I have also drawn on Bruce's 'Notes on the Baloch Tribes of the Dera Ghāzī Khān District.' The details regarding the tribes of Kachhi, and some of those regarding the Marrīs and Bughtīs, are taken from Mr. Hughes Buller's recently issued report on the Balochistan census, which has enabled me to fill in the gaps in the list of the Northern Baloch tribes. I would draw especially attention to the full details given of the Dombkī, Maghassī, and Rind tribes. Unfortunately, the Balochistan census did not extend into Mekrān, and no details of subdivisions can be given for this country, nor for Persian Balochistan, although the Rind, Hot, Lashārī, Korai, Gichkī, and Buledī there form large organized tribes. The same remark applies to the Sīstān and Khārān. I am also without full details as to the Khosas, Jakrānīs, and Burdīs (*Buledhis*) of Northern Sindh.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Bughti, or Zarkānī.	Raheja.	Bibrakzai. Karmānzai. Kasmānī. Mandwānī. Sāhagānī. Syāhinzai. Jobhazai.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Bughti, or Zarkānī (continued).	Nothānī:	Haibatānī.
	1. Zimakānī, or	Mehrānzai.
	Durragh.	Chakrānī.
	2. Pherozani.	Chandrāmzai.
		Haiwānī.
		Nohkānī.
		Pherozānī.
		Phīsh-bur.
		Rāmezai.
		Shalwānī.
		Sundrānī.
	Masorī.	Bagriani.
		Bakshwānī.
		Pherozai.
		Gurriani.
		Jāfarānī.
		Nohkani.
	Kalphur.	Hotakānī.
		Fadlānī.
	Phong, or	{ Darwānī.
	Mondrānī.	{ Gyāndārānī.
Buledhi, or Burdī.		Hājīānī.
		Phong.
	Shambānī, or	{ Kiazai.
	Kīazai.	{ Shambānī.
		{ Saidānī.
	Gola.	
	Jāfuzaī.	
	Kahorkhānī.	
	Kotāchi (Kulāchi?).	
	Lulāi.	
Bozdār.	Pitāfi.	
	Raite.	
	Bakhrī.	
	Rustamānī.	
	Dulānī.	
	Lādwānī.	
	Chākarānī.	
	Sihānī.	
	Shāhwānī.	
	Jāfirānī.	

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Bozdār ( <i>continued</i> ).	Jalālānī. Namurdī. Ghulāmānī (sub- tuman).	{ Bijarānī. Kajānī.
Dombkī, or Domkī.	Baghdar.	Almānī. Chhatānī. Pherozani. Isiānī. Jāroī. Morāī. Philānī. Rānozai. Thathetānī (Thathi- lānī ?).
	Bhand. Brahimānī.	Bhand. Bozerānī. Gajānī. Hastiānī. Kasmānī. Mastiānī. Nahānī. Rakhiānī.
	Dinārī.	Ishkānī. Murīdānī.
	Dirkhānī. Gabol. Ghāziānī.	Dirkhanī. Gabol. Ladhiānī. Ghāziānī.
	Gishkhaurī. Gorgezh. Hārā. Jambānī. Khosā.	Gishkhaurī. Gorgezh. Hārā. Jambānī. Pachizai. Sāhjanī.
	Lashārī. Mahamdānī.	Lashārī. Birmānī. Isabānī. Mīrwānī. Nihālzai.
	Mirozai.	Allāhdūdai. Bhūtānī. Dildārzai.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Dombkī, or Domkī ( <i>continued</i> ).	Mirozai ( <i>continued</i> ).	Hāsilkhānzai. Hotiānī. Jalālkhānzai. Muhammadkhānzai. Tharozai.
	Shabkhor.	Changwānī. Jahlwānī. Shabkhor.
	Singiānī.	Singiānī.
	Sohriānī.	Chakrānī. Dadrānī. Dilāwarānī. Kasmānī. Mazārānī. Mirdādzai. Shāhozai. Sohrābzai.
	Tālānī.	Fazlānī. Khairoānī. Nodhwānī.
	Wazīrānī.	Atrānī. Mandwānī. Wazīrkhānzai.
	Gadānī.	Gadānī.
	Karmānī.	
	Mingwānī.	
	Gulphādh.	
	Sargānī.	
	Arbānī.	
	Jistkānī.	
	Isanānī.	
Drishak.		
Gurchānī.	(a) <i>Dodai Gurchānīs.</i>	
	1. Shaihakānī :	{ Jalabānī. Bakarānī. Mankanī. Dodānī. Sheikhānī. Mehānī. Bābulānī. Mithānī.
	Khakhalānī.	
	Shakhalānī.	

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Gurchānī (continued).	2. Hotwānī.	Sanjānī. Bābulānī. Chutiānī. Manakānī. Kasmānī. Kulangānī.
	3. Khalilānī.	Bakrānī. Bahādurānī. Gorpatānī.

(b) *Rinds, or Lashārīs.*

Chācharīs.	4. Bāzgīr.	Maparwānī. Pabadānī. Dalālānī. Brahimānī.
	5. Jistkānī.	Dadānī. Fathiānī. Kingānī. Phaujwānī. Dilshād/hānī. Gharam.
	6. Pitāfi.	Jarwānī. Hātmānī. Katalānī. Brāhimānī. Matkānī. Janglānī. Sarmorānī. Thulrānī.
	7. Jogiānī.	} Mewānī. Ahmdānī.
	8. Chāng.	
		Kingānī. Kohnānī.
	9. Holawānī.	Vadānī. Ludānī. Matkanī. Harwānī.
	10. Suhrānī.	Mīrakānī. Mūsānī. Sawānī.
	(c) 11. Durkānī, (sub-tuman).	Alkānī. Gandagwālagh.



TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Jackrānī ( <i>continued</i> ).	Karorkānī. Dirkānī.	
Kasrānī.	Lashkarānī.	{ Alānī. Lakhnī. Rustamānī.
	Rūbadan.	{ Mamdānī. Rūbadan.
	Budānī.	Budānī.
	Wāsūānī.	Wāsūānī.
	Leghārī.	{ Lailānī.
	Khepdīn.	{ Shāhlānī.
	Jarwār.	Jarwar.
	Badā.	{ Tahorī. Wasmanānī.
Khosa.	Balelānī. Jangel. Jindānī. Jiānī. Jarwār. Hamalānī. Tombiwāla. Mihrwānī. Isiānī. Hāltī. Jajela. Lashārī. Umarānī.	

N.B.—The above are the clans of the Dera Ghāzi Khān tuman. I have not been able to obtain the names of the clans of the Khosas of North Sindh.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Leghārī.	1. Aliānī.	Dodiānī. Muridānī. Pheroānī. Nidamānī. Malhānī. Jamālkhānānī. Brahimānī.



TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Leghārī ( <i>continued</i> ).	2. Jogiānī.	Mirziānī. Sangarānī. Mastoī.
	3. Bughlānī.	Rustamānī. Sirkānī.
	4. Haibatānī.	Haibatānī.
	5. Ramdānī.	(In Sindh.)
	6. Hijbānī.	Bijarānī. Shahānī.
	7. Tālbur.	Gurmānī. Bijarānī.
	8. Chāndya.	Chāndya.
	9. Kaloī.	Nāngri. Suhṛānī.
	10. Haddiānī (sub-tuman).	
	(1) Ahmadānī.	Anglānī. Bahārkhānī. Haiderānī. Hajiānī. Khāniānī.
	(2) Buloānī.	Anglānī. Bagariānī. Baglānī. Buloānī. Bijarānī. Hajiānī. Ismailānī. Jakhwānī. Jangwānī. Jariānī. Khedrānī. Sarbānī. Shadiānī. Shahānī.
	11. Batwānī.	Hajiānī. Shahānī.
Lund (of Tibbi).	1. Lund.	
	2. Khosa.	{ Chāndya. Khosa.
	3. Rind.	

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Lund (of Sorī).	1. Haidarānī.	Haidarānī.
	2. Ahmdānī	Ludānī.
		Mahmdānī.
		Moriānī.
		Gumrānī.
		Dangwānī.
		Jangwānī.
	3. Gorchānī.	Gorchānī.
	4. Kaliānī.	Mūsarānī.
		Bālkānī.
		Bakarānī.
		Sabzānī.
		Hotwānī.
		Gajānī.
Marri.		Beg.
	5. Gadharoānī, or Garāzwānī.	Gadharoānī.
		Ludhiānī.
		Phulānī.
		Turbānī.
		Sihānī.
	6. Zariānī.	Zariānī.
	7. Nuhānī.	Nuhānī.
	1. Ghazanī.	Bahāwalzai ( <i>Chiefs' Section</i> )
		Tingīānī.
		Aliānī.
		Nodhbandaghānī.
		Muhandānī.
		Chūrī.
		Lorī-khush.
		Mazārānī.
		Ispahānī.
		Badānī.
		Jarwār.
		Zhing.
		Langānī.
		Chhilgarī.
		Mehakānī.
		Shahānī.
		Murghīānī.
	2. Bijarānī.	Kalandarānī.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Marri ( <i>continued</i> ).		Salārānī.
		Sumrānī.
		Phīrdādānī.
		Mandwānī.
		Ramkānī.
		Khalwānī.
		Kungrānī.
		Shaheja.
		Phawādi.
		Ramkānī.
		Kaisarānī.
	3. Loharānī.	Khunarānī.
		Sherānī.
		Mahmdānī.
		Gusrānī.
		Durkānī.
		Jalambānī.
		Jindwānī.
		Melohar.
		Sarangānī.
	4. Mazārānī.	Hijbānī.
		Changulānī.
		Mānikānī.
		Mehkānī.
		Badānī.
		Aliānī.
		Sherānī.
Mazārī.	1. Bālāchānī.	Gulsherānī.
		Mistakānī.
		Azādānī.
		Māchiānī.
		Haidarānzai.
		Saidānzai.
		Khudādādānī.
		Haibatānī.
		Radānī.
		Badhelānī.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Mazārī ( <i>continued</i> ).	2. Rustamānī.	Phīrukānī. Marānī. Adiānī. Harwānī. Bungrānī. Abdulānī. Kaisarānī. Shābarkānī. Minglānī. Dārwanī. Sarwānī. Nadhānī. Chonglānī. Zimakānī. Mirīanī. Gulāb. Lālānī. Gulānī. Isiānī. Gulrānī. Bannū. Tālbur.
Syāh-lāf Mazārīs.	3. Masīdānī.	Salātānī. Lulā. Dulānī. Nohkānī. Sanjarānī. Saindānī. Shaheja. Vahānī. Nodhakānī. Latānī. Haurānī. Sureja. Garānī. Tukurānī. Bhamborānī. Mirakānī. Pothhānī. Isānī. Jaurakānī. Samlānī. Shulānī.
	4. Sargānī.	Sargānī.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Mazārī ( <i>continued</i> ).	5. Kird.	Jaloī. Kird.
Rind (of Kachhī).	1. Azdī. 2. Badīnī. 3. Bijarzai. 4. Buzdār. 5. Chākarānī. 6. Chāndya.	Chakarānī. Dāngezai. Ishāqzai. Phulūzai. Chāndya.
	7. Chhalgarī. 8. Chawalānī. 9. Dinārī Isrānī. 10. Pherozaī. 11. Gabol. 12. Gadāī. 13. Gadri. 14. Ghulām Bolak.	Sarāī. Alianī. Choliānī. Jagiānī.
		Isabānī { Khiānī. Mandwānī. Nindwanī.
	15. Gorīshiānī. 16. Gurchānī. 17. Gurgez h. 18. Gurgezai. 19. Hadakarī. 20. Hadwār. 21. Hothānzai. 22. Indra.	Umrānī. Chamra. Haslānī.
	23. Isānī. 24. Jamālī (sub-tuman).	Chhalgarī. Mundrānī. Newārī-wens. Jamālī.
	25. Jatoi.	Brāhimānī. Būlānī. Hājihānzai.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Rind (of Kachhi)— <i>continued.</i>		Jamālānī. Lahorzai. Pherozānī. Sheh.
	26. Kahīrī.	
	27. Kalwānī.	
	28. Karmūzai.	
	29. Khosa (sub-tuman).	Bakhrānī. Gānānī. Sākhānī. Shāhānī. Umarānī. Khosa.
	30. Kaloī.	
	31. Kulāchī.	
	32. Kolank.	
	33. Kuchīk.	Chotāi. Syāhphādh. Jalambānī.
	34. Legharī.	
	35. Lashārī.	
	36. Lund.	
	37. Masorī.	
	38. Mehrālī.	Mehrānī.
	39. Mughērī.	
	40. Muradkhel.	Mīrozaī.
	41. Nāhar.	
	42. Nakhezai.	
	43. Naushēr wānī.	
	44. Nindwānī.	Hanjwānī.
	45. Paindzai.	
	46. Phīrukānī.	
	47. Pitāfi.	
	48. Phugh.	Jogī.
	49. Phuzh.	
	50. Raheja.	Badizai. Sahākānī. Sānānī. Sekānī. Sharkānī. Shaihakānī.
	51. Rahejo.	
	52. Rakhshānī.	
	53. Rāmezai.	


TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Rind (of Kachhī)— <i>continued.</i>	54. Rozi.	
	55. Rustamānī.	
	56. Sohriānī.	Bāgarzai. Hājihānzai. Nindwānī.
	57. Sarkhī.	
	58. Shahejā.	
	59. Shār.	
	60. Sundrānī.	
	61. Sohriānī (2).	
Kahīrī.	1. Bulānī.	Bambuwānī. Mundwānī. Nihālzai. Sumarzai. Bandlanī. Jānbānī. Mīrzaī. Mundhānī. Sadīkānī. Hamāmānī. Hazūrānī. Nūrānī.
	2. Muradānī.	Ahmadānī. Allāh-bakhsh-zaī. Budrānī. Nūrānī. Wazīrānī.
	3. Kalandarānī.	
	4. Tāhirānī.	
Maghassī.	1. Bhūtānī.	
	2. Bijarānī.	
	3. Bangulānī.	Jīgānī.
	4. Boltī.	
	5. Chandrāmā.	
	6. Faslānī.	
	7. Gādhī.	
	8. Gagrān.	
	9. Gola.	
	10. Hisbānī.	Haidarānī. Hisbānī.
	11. Jagīrānī.	
	12. Kotohar.	
	13. Lāshārī.	Alkāī. Bhangarānī. Bhūtānī.

TRIBE.	CLAN.	SEPT.
Maghassī (continued).		Dīnārzai.
		Gajānī.
		Gorānī.
		Jahāwānī.
		Jānī.
		Laklānī.
		Manghiānī.
		Mīanzai.
		Muhamdānī.
		Sumrānī.
		Tājānī.
		Tumpānī.
		Wāsūwānī.
	14. Laskānī.	
	15. Mīrzānī.	
	16. Muhamdānī.	
	17. Mughērī.	Bamberānī.
		Bhand.
		Hajījā.
		Jāmra.
		Kalānī.
		Khor.
		Mīrozai.
		Rehānzai.
		Sarājānī.
	18. Raheja.	
	19. Shābrānī.	
	20. Shāhmūrzai.	
	21. Shambānī.	Shambānī.
		Safrānī.
	22. Syāhzai.	
	23. Tarīhalī.	
	24. Umrānī.	Abdulzai.
		Bhīrānī.
		Bhūtānī.
		Dilāwarzai.
		Gorshānī.
		Jongānī.
		Paliānī.
		Sobhānī.
	25. Wasdānī.	
Umrānī.	Subdivisions not re- corded.	



# APPENDIX III.


## GENEALOGICAL TABLES SHOWING THE CONNECTION OF THE VARIOUS TRIBES ACCORDING TO BALUCH TRADITION.



N.B.—The following tables show the descent of the existing tribes from the above.


## II.

## DESCENDANTS OF RIND.



## III.

Sahāk (see II.).




<sup>1</sup> Said to be of Afghān origin in Balochistan Census Report, 1902, pp. 100, 103.

## IV.

Naubat(see II.).

Brāhim.

Mubārak.

Koh-phrosh, *alias* Leghar.

Clans forming the main body of the Leghūrī  
tribe of Dera Ghazi Khān.

(Leghārīs  
of Sindh).

(Probably the Jogīānī clan should be added to these. The other  
clans given above in Appendix II. do not belong to the original  
Leghūrīs).

## V.

DESCENT OF THE PRESENT BUGHTĪ CHIEF FROM GYĀNDĀR (SEE III.).

Gyāndār.

Raheja.<sup>1</sup>

Kalo.

Bīvaragh, or Bībrak.

Salem.

Gola Shāh.

Nohakh.

Fatḥ Muḥammad.

Salem.

Ghulām Murtiza.

Nawāb Sir Shāhbāz Khān, K.C.I.E.,  
present Tumandār.


Gauhar Khān, etc.

N.B.—Ahmad Khān states that the Jakrānīs and the Ahmdānīs of  
Mānā also descend from Gyāndār.

<sup>1</sup> Hence Rahejā clan.


## VI.

PEDIGREE OF LUND AND SHAMBĀNĪ CHIEFS FROM ĀLĪ (SEE III.).

<sup>1</sup> Hence the town of Shādan Lund.<sup>2</sup> Hence the name Sori Lund.<sup>3</sup> Hence the name Shambānī.


## VII.

## DESCENDANTS OF LĀSHĀR (SEE I.).




## VIII.

## DESCENDANTS OF HOT (SEE I.).

<sup>1</sup> Hence the Bhutānī clan of Maghassīs.<sup>2</sup> Hence the name Maghassī.

## IX.


THE PEDIGREE OF THE MAZĀRĪ TUMANDĀR (BELONGING TO THE BALĀCHĀNĪ CLAN, FROM SAHĀK (SEE VIII.).



<sup>1</sup> Hence the name Bālāchānī.

## X

PEDIGREE OF KHOSA CHIEFS, FROM HAMAL (SEE VIII.).

<sup>1</sup> Hence the town of Bātil, tribal headquarters.<sup>2</sup> See account by Herbert Edwardes in 'A Year on the Punjāb Frontier,' 1849.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

### I. TRAVELS AND EXPLORATIONS.

- POTTINGER: 'Travels in Beloochistan.' London, 1815.  
MASSON: 'Travels in Balochistan, Afghanistan, etc.' 4 vols.  
London, 1844.  
FERRIER: 'Caravan Journeys.' London, 1857.  
EASTWICK: 'Dry Leaves from Young Egypt.' London, 1851.  
BELLEW: 'From the Indus to the Tigris.' London, 1874.  
BURTON: 'Sind Revisited.' London, 1877.  
ST. JOHN, LOVETT: 'Eastern Persia.' 2 vols. London, 1876.  
FLOYER: 'Unexplored Balochistan.' London, 1882.  
NAPIER: 'Administration of Scinde.' 1851.  
HOLDICH: 'Our Indian Borderland.' London, 1900. And other  
writings.  
CURZON: 'Persia.' 2 vols. London, 1892.  
MACGREGOR: 'Wanderings in Balochistan.' London, 1882.  
MOLESWORTH SYKES: 'Ten Thousand Miles in Persia.' London,  
1902.

### II. ETHNOGRAPHY.

- UJFALVY: 'Les Aryens au Nord et au Sud de l'Hindou Kouch.'  
Paris, 1896.  
BELLEW: 'Ethnography of Afghanistan.' London, 1891.  
RISLEY: 'Tribes and Castes of Bengal.' Calcutta, 1891.  
IBBETSON: 'Outlines of Punjab Ethnography.' Calcutta, 1883.  
HOLDICH: 'The Arabs of our Indian Frontier' (*Journal of the  
Anthropological Institute*, vol. xxix., p. 18).  
LASSEN: *Z. f. d. K. d. M.*, Band 4, pp. 87-122. Bonn, 1842.  
BRUCE: 'Notes on the Baloch Tribes of the Derajat.' Lahore,  
*circa* 1870.  
HUGHES: 'Balochistan.' London, 1877.  
DUKE: 'Report on Thal Chotiali and Harnai.' Calcutta, 1883.  
RAVERTY: 'Notes on Afghanistan.' Calcutta, 1880.  
HUGHES-BULLER: 'Report on Census of Balochistan.' Bombay, 1902.

## III. HISTORY.

- ELLIOTT AND DOWSON: 'The History of India.' 8 vols. London, 1867-1877 (especially vols. i., ii., and v.). Referred to as 'E. D.'
- FERISHTA'S History. Text published by Newal Kishor, Lakhnau.
- ERSKINE: 'Babar and Humāyūn.' 2 vols. London, 1854.
- RAVERTY: 'Translation of Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī.' London, 1881.
- JAUBERT: 'Géographie d'Edrisi.' Paris, 1836.
- OUSELEY'S 'Ibn Haukal' (i.e., Istakhri).
- ZOTENBERG: 'Chronique de Tabarī.' Paris, 1872.
- MORDTMANN: 'Istakhri.' Hamburg, 1845.
- MAS'ŪDĪ. 9 vols. Paris (French translation).
- YĀKŪT'S Geographical Dictionary (French translation).
- HAIG: 'The Indus Delta Country.' London, 1894.
- MOCKLER: 'The Origin of the Baluch.' *J. A. S. B.*, 1895.

## IV. POETRY AND LEGEND.

- DAMES: 'Sketch of the Northern Baluchi Language.' Calcutta, 1881 (*J. A. S. B.*).
- DAMES: 'Baluchi Text-Book.' Lahore, 1891.
- HETU RAM: 'Biluchī-nama.' Lahore, 1881.
- DOUIE: Annotated translation of above, omitting the poems. Calcutta, 1885.
- MAYER: 'Baluch Classics.' Fort Munro and Agra (privately printed), 1900.

## V. LANGUAGE.

In addition to the above given under IV., the works of Mockler and Pearce should be consulted for Mekrānī, and those of Gladstone and Bruce for Northern Baluchi. A complete list will be found in GEIGER: 'Die Sprache der Balūtschen' (*Grundriss d. Ir. Phil.*), Strassburg, 1898, which is the best general work on Baluchī.

# INDEX

## A.

- ADADU'D-DAULA, Dailamī, 32  
 Ādharbaijān, 23  
 Ahlkānī clan of Durkānī, 84  
 Ahmad Khan Ludhiānī, 53  
 Ahmdānī tribe, 59  
 'Alāfī (Arab tribe), 9  
 Alāns, 27  
 Aleppo, 9  
 Aliānī clan, 67, 79  
 Arab origin of Baloches, 11, 12  
 Arab origin of Baloches, 7, 14  
 Arab type, 8, 9, 11  
 Arabic words in Balochi, 24  
 Arghūn Dynasty, 40, 45

## B.

- Bāber's *Autobiography*, 46  
 Badru', 35  
 Bagā Shalamānī, 53  
 Bahrech (Durrānī Afghāns), 14  
 Bālāchānī Mazārīs, 4  
 Bālaichā Chauhāns, 14  
 Baloch, defined, 1  
 Balochi dialects, 3  
 Balochi language, 24  
 Baloch, origin of name, 15, 21-23  
 Bāltīs, 13  
 Bālistān, 13  
 Bellew, Dr. H. W., 7, 14  
 Bhera, 46  
 Bilāzūrī, 29  
 Bilāch tribe, 2  
 Bolak, 4, 5  
 Bolān Pass, 3  
 Boleda Valley, 19  
 Bozdār tribe, 5, 6, 24, 49, 57, 77  
 Brahoī element in Balochī, 24  
 Brahoī race, 1-3, 40, 41

- Bughtī tribe, 5, 6, 49, 57, 78, 79  
 Buledhī or Buledī tribe, 3, 5, 17-19, 36, 37, 51, 57, 76  
 Bulmat tribe, 54  
 Burdī. *See* Buledhī  
 Burdika, 49  
 Burton, Sir R., 8

## C.

- Chākur, Mir, 42 45  
 Chāndko, 48  
 Chāndya tribe, 47, 49, 54  
 Changiz Khān, invasions of, 34, 35  
 Chattā Bakhshā (Jhang), 48  
 Chauhān Rājputs, 14, 15  
 Crooke, Mr. W., views of, 15, 21  
 Curzon's 'Persia,' 33

## D.

- Dasht, 19  
 Dashtī tribe, 19, 39, 54  
 Dera Fatḥ Khan, 46  
 Dera Ghāzī Khān, 1, 39, 46  
 Dera Isma'īl Khān, 46  
 Dhankot, 42  
 Dodāī tribe, 2, 54, 84  
 Dodāī tribe, history of, 37-39  
 Dodāī tribe, rivalry with Rinds, 42  
 Dom (minstrel tribe), 17  
 Dombkī tribe, 5, 49, 54, 78  
 Drīshak tribe, 5, 49, 55  
 Duke, Colonel O. T., 53  
 Durkānī clan, 6, 78, 84

## E.

- Eastwick, 50, 53  
 Ephthalites, or White Huns, 29  
 Erī clan, 66

## F.

- Fath Khān, Dodāi, 41, 46  
 Ferrier's 'Caravan Journeys,' 7, 20, 21, 52  
 Firdausi's Shāhnāma, 21, 22, 26-28  
 Firishta's History, 42

## G.

- Gabol tribe, 50, 55  
 Gādhi tribe, 89  
 Gandagwālagh, clan of Durkānīs, 24  
 Gandāva, 3, 46  
 Gedrosia, 9, 22  
 Gedrosii, 9, 22  
 Ghalchas, 10, 11  
 Ghazānī clan, 36, 76  
 Ghāzī Khān, Dodāi, 41, 46  
 Gholo tribe, 89, 55  
 Ghulām-nānī Bozdārs, 6  
 Ghulām Bolak clan, 4, 49, 78  
 Ghulām Muhammad Bālāchānī, 53  
 Gichkī tribe, 16, 51  
 Gish Khaur, 19  
 Gishkhaurī tribe, 19, 59, 77  
 Gil, 27, 28  
 Gilānī, 27, 28  
 Gopāng tribe, 39, 48, 55  
 Gorgezh clan, 49, 55  
 Gulphādh, clan of Drīshaks, 24  
 Gurchānī tribe, 6, 39, 49, 58, 84  
 Gurmānī clan, 48, 60

## H.

- Haddiānī Leghārīs, 6, 77  
 Haibatānī Leghārīs, 6, 79  
 Haig, General, quoted, 43  
 Hajānī clan, 60  
 Hamza, Mīr, 17, 21, 34  
 Hārīn, 36  
 Hasanī tribe, 50, 58  
 Hetū Ram, R. B., 21, 35  
 Hindū Kush, tribes of, 10  
 Holdich, Sir T., 7, 8, 20  
 Hot tribe, 2, 3, 5, 36, 39, 46, 48, 55  
 Hotwānī Gurchānī, 84  
 Hughes-Buller, Mr. R. (Census Report), 5, 51  
 Husain, Shāh, Langūh, 41, 42

## I.

- Idrīsī, 29, 31  
 Imam Bakhsh Khān, Nawāb Sir, 6  
 Iranian origin of Baluch, 7, 13

- Isma'il Khān Dodāi, 41, 46  
 Istakhrī, 29, 31

## J.

- Jacobabad District, 1  
 Jagin, 36  
 Jahlawān, 2  
 Jakhar Jatt, 19  
 Jakrānī tribe, 5, 19, 58  
 Jalāl Khān, Mīr, 36  
 Jām Dynasty (Sammās of Sindh), 38  
 Jatkī element in Balochī, 24  
 Jatoī tribe, 20, 36, 48, 55  
 Jatts among Baloches, 14, 38  
 Jatts in Mekrān and Kermān, 30  
 Jhareja tribe, 38  
 Jindānī clan, 6, 78  
 Jistkānī tribe, 47, 48, 55, 81

## K.

- Kach-Gandāva, 3  
 Kachhī, 3  
 Kahīrī tribe, 19, 20, 49, 58  
 Kai Kāūs, 26  
 Kai Khusrāu, 26  
 Kalhoras of Sindh, 50  
 Kalnat, 20, 49, 50, 55  
 Kalnatī tribe, 20, 49, 50, 55  
 Kaloi clan, 60, 77  
 Kalphur clan of Bughtir, 24  
 Kaodai-Korāi, 16  
 Karāchī, 20  
 Karmatians, 20  
 Kasrānī tribe, 49, 58, 77  
 Kennedy, Mr. J., views of, 13  
 Kerinān, the Baloches in, 14, 29  
 Khabīs, 32  
 Khalīlānī Gurchānīs, 84  
 Khanikoff, views of, 7, 8  
 Khetrān tribe, 16, 17  
 Khosa tribe, 5, 23, 49, 56, 81, 83  
 Khushāb, 46  
 Kirdgālī (Kirdgālī) or Brahōi language, 3  
 Kird. See Kurd  
 Koch race, 2, 23, 26-31  
 Koch race compared with Brahōi, 41  
 Kolānch, 19  
 Korāi tribe, 36, 56, 48, 56  
 Kot-Karor, 42  
 Kulāchī, tribe and town, 19, 20, 48, 60

Kung tribe, 5  
Kupchānī clan, 60  
Kurd tribe, 31, 41, 55

L.

Langāh, tribe and dynasty, 5, 41, 45  
Lāshār, 19  
Lashārī tribe, 3, 6, 19, 36, 56, 81  
Laskānī clan, 60  
Lassen, views of, 7, 21  
Leghārī tribe, 5, 6, 23, 49, 58, 79  
Lorī (minstrel tribe), 17  
Lund tribe, 5, 23, 49, 59, 78, 80  
Luschan, Dr. von, views of, 8  
Lūt (desert), 28, 31

M.

Magas, 19  
Maghassī tribe, 3, 19, 20, 49, 81  
Mahmūd of Ghaznī, 20, 32  
Mamasānī tribe, 17, 52  
Marī tribe, 4, 23, 48, 59, 76, 84  
Mārwarīs, 17  
Mashorī, 60  
Masori clan of Bughti, 60, 62  
Masson, travels of, 7  
Mastoi clan, 60, 77  
Mas'ūdī, 26, 29, 30  
Mazārānī clan, 6, 70  
Mazārī tribe, 4-6, 18, 48, 56, 70, 71, 77, 81, 82  
Med, Medh, 17  
Mekrān, 10, 14, 51  
Mirrānī clan of Dodāī, 39, 48, 84  
Mistakānī clan of Mazārī, 6  
Mlechha, 15, 21  
Mockler, Col. E., 9, 21, 22, 86  
Muhammad bin Sām, 20  
Multān, 41-45

N.

Nāhar tribe, 5  
Nahrūī tribe, 52  
Namurdī clan, 56  
Naushīrvānī tribe, 51  
Naushīrvān, Sassanian King, 27  
Nervūī-Nahrūī, 52  
Nicknames, 23  
Nodhakānī. *See* Nutkānī  
Nodhakānī, 18  
Noh, 18  
Noh. *See* Nuhānī

Nuhānī tribe, 56, 78  
Nūmrīs, 15  
Nutkānī tribe, 18, 49, 60

P.

Parthia, Parthians, 9, 13  
Phalli, defined, 4-6  
Phārū, defined, 4  
Phulejī (Pūlajī), 18  
Phuzh clan of Rinds, 56  
Pitāfī clan, 60  
Pottinger's travels, 7, 8, 85  
Proper names of Baloches, 25

Q.

Qaiṣarānī. *See* Kasrānī  
Qandrānī clan, 60  
Qufj. *See* Koch  
Qufṣ. *See* Koch

R.

Rahejā clan of Bughtī, 4, 61, 79  
Rāisūnī clan, 59, 78  
Rajput origin of Baloch discussed, 7, 10, 14-19  
Rakhsh, Rakhshānī (Rashkānī) clan, 16, 57, 78  
Randānī Leghārīs, 79  
Rann of Kach, 15  
Raverty's 'Notes on Afghanistan,' 85  
Raverty's 'Tabakāt-i-Nāṣirī,' 32, 33, 38  
Rind tribe, 3, 5, 36, 37, 57  
Rind tribe, distribution of, 48, 49  
Rind tribe, origin of name of, 15, 23  
Risley's 'Tribes and Castes of Bengal,' 11  
Rustamānī clan of Leghārīs, 79

S.

Saka race, 13  
Sakastene, 13  
Samna Rājput tribe, 38, 42  
Sanjarānī tribe, 52, 60  
Sarawān Brahoīs, 2  
Sarbandī tribe, 52  
Satgarha, 44, 45  
Shāh Beg, Arghūn, 45  
Shāhnāma of Firdausī quoted, 21, 22, 26-28  
Shahrkī tribe, 52  
Shāhākānī Gurehānī, 84  
Shambānī clan, 6, 59, 78, 80  
Shamsu'd-dīn of Sistān, 35

Shikārpur 1  
 Shor, 42  
 Shorkot, 42  
 Sindhī element in Balochī, 24  
 Sindh-Sāgar Dōṇb, 47  
 Sirkānī clan of Leghārīs, 79  
 Sistān (Sijistān) Baloches in, 3, 13,  
 31-35, 51, 52  
 Sitpur, 42  
 Sodhās, 38  
 Sohrāb Dodāī, 41, 84  
 Somra Rājputs, 19, 37, 38  
 Spiegel quoted, 7, 10  
 Suhrānī clan, 60  
 Syāh-lāf Mazārīs, 24, 77  
 Syāh-phādh Durkānīs, 23, 78  
 Sykes, Major P. Molesworth,  
 quoted, 7  
 T.  
 Tabarī's History, 26, 29  
 T. I. ... 32, 33  
 ... 84  
 Tājiks, 10-12  
 Takar ( ... Marris), 4  
 Tālpur ...  
 Tārīkh-i-Ma'sūmī, 38, 43  
 Tārīkh-i-Sher-Shāhī, 42, 45

Tarkhān-nāma, 45  
 Trumpp, Dr., 10  
 Tuhfatu'l-Kirām, 36  
 Tuman, defined, 2, 3  
 Tumandār, 2, 3  
 Turbat-i-Haidarī, 33  
 Turkī words in Balochī, 13  
 Turkomans, comparison with, 7, 9

## U.

Ujfalvy, M. de, 10, 12  
 Umarānī tribe, 36, 37, 49, 76

## W.

Weil's 'Geschichte der Chalifen,' 29  
 White Huns, 29

## Y.

Yākūt's geography quoted, 29, 31,  
 32

## Z.

Zarkān (Kākar Afghāns), 59  
 Zarkānī=Bughtī, 59  
 Zmarai Afghāns, 19  
 Zu'n-nūn Beg Arghūn (Zunū), 43,  
 44  
 Zutt=Jatt, 30







2(10)

1



Cost  
5/19/17

CATALOGUED.

12c  
8

*"A book that is shut is but a block"*

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
GOVT. OF INDIA  
Department of Archaeology  
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book  
clean and moving.